

2

A N  
E X A M I N A T I O N  
O F T H E  
Bishop of Cloyne's Defence of his Principles;  
W I T H  
OBSERVATIONS ON SOME OF HIS LORDSHIP'S APOLOGISTS,  
P A R T I C U L A R L Y  
T H E R E V. D R. S T O C K :  
C O N T A I N I N G  
AN INQUIRY INTO THE CONSTITUTION AND EFFECTS OF OUR  
ECCLESIASTICAL ESTABLISHMENT;  
A N D A L S O,  
AN HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE POLITICAL PRINCIPLES  
A N D C O N D U C T O F  
P R E S B Y T E R I A N S A N D E P I S C O P A L S  
I N  
G R E A T - B R I T A I N A N D I R E L A N D .  
W I T H  
A Defence of the Church of Scotland  
F R O M T H E  
C H A R G E O F P E R S E C U T I O N  
B R O U G H T B Y H I S L O R D S H I P ' S A P O L O G I S T .

K  
BY WILLIAM CAMPBELL, D.D. MINISTER OF ARMAGH.

B E L F A S T :  
PRINTED BY H. JOY, SEN. AND JUN. HIGH-STREET.

M.DCC.LXXX.VIII.



Doctor Campbell's Examination of the Bishop of Cloyne's Defence of his Principles, with his Answer to Dr Stock, is a work that sets him very high in the ranks of Literature.

Whilst his arguments are so strong as to flash conviction, even, on the unwilling mind, his temper & good manners do him much credit as a Gentleman & a Scholar. No petulant pertness disgraces his page. And cautious<sup>ly</sup>, avoiding the flimsy, frippery of tinsel ornament, he expresses his thoughts with a perspicuity & precision not often to be met with in polemical writings.

The effect of his work corresponds to the good sense & ability he has displayed in it. And we will venture to predict, that though he may be replied to, he cannot be answered.

Dublin June 10. 1700. E. O. Anonymous.



---

A

## D E F E N C E, &c.

---

*Then the presidents and princes sought to find occasion against Daniel concerning the kingdom, but they could find none occasion for fault: forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him.*

*Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God.*

DANIEL, CH. VI. V. 4, 5.

---

**T**HE very unkind and unprovoked attack, made of late, on the Presbyterians of Ireland, could not fail of raising their just resentment. It raised, also, a generous resentment in the breasts of moderate churchmen, who, as friends of our happy constitution, think it best secured by cultivating peace and harmony among the different parties that subsist among us. They know, and have the liberality of mind to do jus-

B

tice



tice to our political principles; and acknowledge with pleasure that the safety of the state has, at different periods, been essentially promoted by the jealous attention and vigorous exertions of Protestant Dissenters. To this the history of England and of Ireland, for near two centuries, bears the most ample and unequivocal testimony. What was the intention of the Bishop of Cloyne in giving a representation of the principles and character of Presbyterians, so very injurious to them, every one will conjecture according to the view he sees it in. They, however, are persuaded, it could not be friendly to them, or to the interest of this kingdom: and that the operation of the principles he has laid down, must be destructive of the public welfare, should they be adopted by men in power, so far as to influence the conduct of Government.

I need scarcely observe, because every one knows, that the present debate was not moved by Presbyterians, who wished rather to cultivate peace and a good understanding with men of every description. But since the question has been, as we think, most improperly brought before the public, a high sense of duty, not only to ourselves, but to our country, demands that it should be examined in the fullest manner, with fairness and candour. To this purpose, his Lordship was called upon, in a **VINDICATION** of the Principles and Character of the Presbyterians of Ireland, to review the subject. The argument was taken up on the ground that he had pointed out; that is, "on facts of so general a nature as to support political conclusions."\*

\* Bishop of Cloyne—State of the Church of Ireland, p. 40, third edit.

These conclusions were, that the Presbyterians have ever been a steady, and determined body, firmly *united* in support of the constitution—But the members of the Episcopal church were not united, but a *divided* body—That the clergy particularly, were the zealous advocates of *arbitrary* power—And that the influence of the hierarchy had so far poisoned the mind of government and of the people, as at different periods, to bring these nations to the verge of ruin.

His Lordship, it would seem, ought to have met us fairly on the ground that he had chosen, and if he could not defend his *assertions* on the authority of history, to have acknowledged himself mistaken, and made such APOLOGY to the nation, as the greatness of the subject demanded.† But, he has done neither of these. For in a late edition of his book, he has endeavoured to defend himself, not by denying any of these conclusions, nor entering into an historical examination of them—that he most cautiously declines.—His mode of defence is very different. He alleges, first, that his antagonists have united to support his assertion, that the church was in danger.

“ All my antagonists—borne away, as it should  
 “ seem, by a violence natural enough to the  
 “ disappointment of a favourite scheme, con-  
 “ spire to prove that assertion, which is one of  
 “ the main columns of my reasoning, that the  
 B 2 “ church

† “ The candid and penetrating will believe me when I  
 “ declare, that sensible of the uncertainty of all human  
 “ evidence, I shall not unwillingly retract where I have  
 “ erred without intention ; nor be backward to remedy,  
 “ by a proper recantation, the evils a too hasty judgment  
 “ might otherwise occasion.” JUNIUS.



“ church of Ireland is in danger, from the *wish*  
 “ of the Dissenters either to set up another ec-  
 “ clestiaftical establishment, or to pull down all  
 “ establishments.”†

What favourite *scheme* is here alluded to, I know not. Nor have I heard of any of his antagonists being borne away by any violence, among us, which in his Lordship's opinion, was natural enough to the disappointment of a favourite scheme. Why did he not tell us, when this *scheme* was formed—who were the authors of it—what was its magnitude—at what time it was set in agitation by us, and at length disappointed. As this is all a mystery, we must wait till his Lordship thinks fit to explain it. Then we shall be able to judge, whether this charge is only imaginary, or whether it is founded on “ facts of so general a nature as to support political conclusions.”

But, how does it appear, that any “ main column of his reasoning” is supported by a *wish* of Dissenters, so full of danger to the church of Ireland? He has not proved, nor has he attempted to prove, that “ the church is so *essentially* united to the civil constitution, that the subversion of one must necessarily overthrow the other.” And until this be proved all his reasoning falls to the ground. This is his main column, which at present rests on no other foundation than his Lordship's *assertion*, in direct opposition to the plainest historical evidence, which has been laid before him, and which he has not contradicted.

If he would support his *assertion*, and enter into the subject in a satisfactory manner, it would be necessary to give a clear and explicit description

tion of what he means by the *church*. And it is the more necessary, because it is an *equivocal* term, as had been already observed, and therefore his Lordship was called upon to lay before his readers a particular account of it. But to this he is silent. And on the footing he has placed it, it is, perhaps, impossible to form any distinct idea of it.

1. He has referred us, in the first instance, to *Magna Charta*, for the church of England, which in his opinion was then placed in a most honourable point of view. And yet it was then not only a Popish church, but subjected to the court of Rome in a manner so oppressive and degrading, as could never be endured in France, nor even in Italy by the state of Venice. And tho' several editions of his book have been printed since this was laid before his Lordship, who at first might have been thought to mention it inadvertently, yet he still has retained it as a just description of the church of England, without any explanation.

2. At another time, he refers us to the Revolution, for the church of England, long after it had been built on the ruins of the ancient church. And yet in his Lordship's judgment, these are both the church of England, though they were formed in direct opposition to each other, acknowledging subjection to different heads, the King and the Pope, and with different and opposite privileges. And what is still more extraordinary, he tells us, that *one* of these churches is "a congenial system of arbitrary dominion," and contends at the same time, that it is *essentially* incorporated with a free state. But still, if in his opinion, these churches are the same, and each  
of



of them *properly* to be called that church of England, to which he is devoted, what are we to think of his Lordship's principles? And if they are different, is it an unreasonable demand, to ask, to which of them he gives the preference, as his declaration on that subject must materially affect his whole system of ecclesiastical polity, and perhaps throw light upon it, and give it greater or less weight with the public.

3. But this is not all; for we are still farther referred to our *antient legislators*, in what remote period of antiquity, we are left to conjecture.

“ The actual incorporation of our ecclesiastical constitution with the civil is now acknowledged; and the late exhibition of the principles of the Churches of Rome and Scotland, and their political operation, leave little doubt of the wisdom of our *antient legislators* in giving it the preference.”\*

Here the matter is involved in still greater obscurity, by expressions still more general and indefinite. His Lordship had been speaking of *original principles*, without telling what they were, and then mentioning *antient legislators*, the thoughts are naturally led back to a high antiquity, according to one's fancy, perhaps to the Saxon monarchs, or the first kings of the Norman line. And under these princes, we find the ecclesiastical constitutions different from one another, † and each of them different from those mentioned above. But instead of these *antient legislators*,  
the

\* Preface, p. 11, 12.

† Rapin's Hist. of Eng.—Hume's Hist. of Eng. vol. I. p. 221.—Lord Littleton's Hist. of Henry II. vol. I. p. 53. vol. II. p. 363.

the passage, just cited, carries us down to a much later period, so far down as when the Church of Scotland was established, and points out to some deliberations, or comparison of the relative merit of the several churches, when the wisdom of the legislature gave the preference to what this Lordship calls "our ecclesiastical constitution." This must be later than the reign of Elizabeth; for when the Church of England was established in her reign, the Church of Scotland was not in being. Thus we are brought down to the last century in search of an ecclesiastical constitution; to which our *antient* legislators gave a preference to that of Scotland. The first deliberation of that sort which we find in history, is in the reign of Charles I. when the wisdom of our legislators did the reverse of what his Lordship asserts, for the preference was given to the Church of Scotland. And it was not till after the restoration of Charles II. that upon such deliberation, the Church of England had the preference. So that we know not who these *antient legislators* are, that his Lordship speaks of; the words have a pleasing majestic sound, and we are apt to annex the idea of wisdom to antiquity; but until he describes, among these various ecclesiastical constitutions, what particular one it is, which he so much admires, it is not possible to judge whether it was dictated by wisdom, or was the effect of weakness or ambition.

But he says, these *antient legislators* gave it the *preference*: on which we may just observe, that if they only thought it deserved a preference, they had no idea of his principle, that it was *essentially* incorporated with the state, or that there was any *natural* union between them.

Let



Let us now consider his Lordship's observations on what he calls "the late exhibition of the principles of the Churches of Rome and Scotland, and their political operation." The danger of the Church and State, he finds in the political operation of a "*wish* of the Dissenters," as we have seen, "either to set up another ecclesiastical establishment, or to pull down all establishments." And he has found out, it seems, that I am of the former party : for he says ;

"Dr. Campbell goes further, he anticipates the overthrow of it, and apostrophises with an air of triumph, *Don't be afraid, on the deposing of your Church, that Presbyterians will not be ready to make a proffer of their own, for the maintenance of Government, and the Protestant ascendancy.* I really had no doubt, but that some of the Presbyterian clergy would readily accept our benefices, bishopricks excepted : but I am still of opinion that few, if any, of the great body of the laity of that persuasion in this kingdom so strongly wish to render their pastors *independent of them*, as to be disposed to submit to tythe or tax for that purpose."\*

It would have been satisfactory, had his Lordship pointed out from whence he got this quotation, which he ascribes to me, and which he has marked as my words. He has made no reference to any page, as in his quotations from his other opponents—and the reader will search for it in vain in the VINDICATION. But, if he is curious, and will turn to Dr. Stock's REPLY, p. 14. he will find his Lordship has very carefully copied it from thence ; and has borrowed, also, his manner of introducing it, and his observations that follow.

\* Preface, p. 9.

follow—His *anticipating*, and *triumph*, and readiness in finding successors to their benefices, are all the ingenious suggestions of his Lordship's apologist.

Here I will make no remarks, except, if it may add strength to his Lordship's defence, to tell him, what he has overlooked, and what I have repeatedly declared, that my opinion is most decidedly against ecclesiastical establishments. And if the established church of this kingdom should hereafter be reformed, which many of her members anxiously desire, as well as Dissenters, that my *wish* is, that the wisdom of government would lead them to reject every *political* institution of religion, and that they would establish the BIBLE alone as the religion of Protestants, and make the "rule of christianity the sole rule of conformity." And if the Presbyterian church should then be comprehended and *endowed*, his Lordship is much mistaken in alleging that the ministers would thereby become independent of the people. That opinion arises from not knowing our discipline, which being formed on that *internal* power by which the early christian church was governed, our discipline remaining the same, as it must do, the mutual dependence of ministers and people must still continue.

We are told again, that it was enough to *exhibit* those dangerous opinions: "I say to *exhibit*, "for I did not controvert *their truth*. It was "quite sufficient for my immediate purpose to "state them, and their dangerous tendency to "the constitution."\*

C

And



And yet he acknowledges that he wrote in haste—that the subject was of “ great delicacy, “ and the time allowed him insufficient to give “ it an adequate discussion.”\* But since his first publication, he has had abundance of time for a more mature and accurate discussion, which from his own declaration would seem wanting; and the objections of his opponents afforded a fair occasion, and made it still the more necessary. An inquiry of this nature, performed in a masterly manner, with the enlarged views of a philosopher or politician, would be kindly received, and would confer a general obligation, if, indeed, it be of national moment. But, instead of such inquiry, worthy, it should seem, of a man of learning, and especially of one who introduced the debate, how are we disappointed to find that he entrenches himself behind a distant reserve, and assumes rather something like a dissatisfied appearance, than the communicative and ingenuous manner of a philosopher. He should have considered that this conduct might be liable to unfavourable construction. That it might disappoint his friends, as if it were giving up a cause, that could not be defended. That it might be imputed by others, not so much to dignity of character, as to some sort of method of saving appearances. They would be ready to allege, that it was easily seen through, and could deceive no one. That such appearance was not new, but had been assumed, occasionally, to get rid of an argument, in which a man would avoid committing himself.† They might think, that this was

\* Preface, p. 3.

\* J'ai donne' mon *Mandement* : je n'irai point répondre à tout ce que vous dites : mais lisez-le, ce *Mandement*, & vous verrez que j'ai résolu tous vos doutes. Il m'a fallu bien suer pour le faire, dit-il, en portant la main sur le front :

was, scarcely, an honourable retreat for a learned man, who can have no resource but in argument.

However, in this manner, we are told, “ the work is done—a review of the *original* principles of a constitution like ours, which will stand that examination, is at all times useful—at the late crisis, such a review was become absolutely necessary.”\*

But, what are those *original* principles? and where shall we find a “ full discussion of these momentous questions?” In regard to our civil constitution, I don’t find either in the Bishop’s book, or in those of his apologists, that the first principles of it have been at all discussed, or even mentioned. Indeed, it would seem, that the subject did not lead to the examination, much less a “ full discussion” of any of the original prin-

C 2

front: j’ai eu besoin de toute ma doctrine, & il m’a fallu lire bien des Auteurs Latins. Je le crois, dit un homme, qui se trouva-là, car c’est un bel Ouvrage, & je desie ce jésuite, qui vient si souvent vous voir, d’en faire un meilleur. Et bien, lisez-le donc, reprit-il, & vous serez plus instruit sur ce matieres dans un quart-d’heure, que si je vous en avois parlé deux heures. Voilà comme il évitoit d’entrer en conversation, & de commettre sa suffisance. Mais comme il se vit pressé, il fut obligé de sortir de ses retrenchemens, & il commença à dire théologiquement force sottises, soutenu d’un Dervis, qui les lui rendoit tres-respectueusement.— Quand deux hommes qui étoient là lui nioient quelque principe, il disoit d’abord: cela est certain, nous l’avons jugé ainsi, & nous sommes des Juges infaillibles. Et comment, lui dis-je, pour lors, êtes-vous des juges infaillibles? ne voyez-vous pas, reprit-il, que le saint Esprit nous eclaire? Cela est heureux, lui repondis-je; car de la maniere dont vous avez parlé, tout aujourd’hui, je reconnois que vous avez grand besoin d’être éclairé. Lettres Persanes, XCVIII.

\* Preface, p. 10, 11.



Note  
16.

principles of the constitution. For what had that to do with disputes about payment of tithes. The subject appeared to be a discussion of ecclesiastical polity, or of some fancied alliance between church and state, with a view, from assumed *principles*, without any proof, to exalt the hierarchy by some mysterious words, to a very high imaginary importance in our constitution. None of our political writers, or our most approved historians, ever dreamed that these *principles*, or any thing similar to them, were original principles of the constitution. We find no such thing in Harrington or Sidney, in Locke or Acherly, or in Lord Lyttleton, our most judicious historian, who has accurately investigated the *principles* of the constitution. Nor do we find any such idea in Montesquieu, or Delolme, or in any other foreign political writers, who have made the Britannic constitution their particular study. So that the scheme advanced by his Lordship is only the fond opinion of some ecclesiastics, who would make religion the handmaid of ambition and wordly greatness.

Thus he tells us, “ the business of this little tract is to place the church in a point of view merely *political*; to prove to the gentlemen of landed property in this kingdom, that it is so *essentially* incorporated with the state, that the subversion of the one must *necessarily* overthrow the other.”\*

If this be one of his *original* principles, and the *main column* of his reasoning, it is easy to observe, that the testimony of history, the most satisfactory of all, is in direct opposition to it, for every one knows, the present established church had

had no existence till after the Reformation. And as to the danger of the state from the subversion of the church, it may be farther observed, that the ecclesiastical establishment under Magna Charta, which is so much a favourite with his Lordship, and whose rights and liberties he boasts of, though they degraded the kingdom, exempted the clergy from subjection to their sovereign and the laws of their country, and established a humiliating dependence on a foreign jurisdiction, by appeals to the court of Rome; this *favourite* church, I say, with all her *liberties*, was subverted by Henry VIII. but the constitution was not overthrown. The Protestant church, established by this king and his son Edward VI. was subverted by Queen Mary, and the church of Rome restored. This was again overturned by Queen Elizabeth, and gave place to another. And yet in these various revolutions of the church, the civil constitution was not overthrown. They were all called the church of England, whether Popish or Protestant. And it plainly appeared that none of them was “essentially incorporated with the state, so that the subversion of the one “must *necessarily* overthrow the other.” This position, therefore, of his Lordship is overturned by historical facts that cannot be controverted.

So that if the church, by the wisdom of our legislators, should be changed, either by reforming it, or by laying it aside, nothing is more obvious, than that this change would not destroy the constitution. On the contrary, history will shew us that the constitution would be stronger without the incorporation, or alliance of this church, or any other church, with the state. For such alliance is destructive of religion, and



as his Lordship expresses it, is " a combination against the natural rights of mankind."\* Nor has he attempted to shew, in any one instance, wherein the ecclesiastical establishment, considered in " a point of view merely political," has supported the state. And in going into an investigation of the effects of this ecclesiastical polity, it will be found that its greatest merit has consisted in being *harmless*, and inactive. And that at all times, when the clergy have attempted to assume power, it was to the injury of the state, and to the destruction of the internal peace of the kingdom. And whenever any of our princes trusted to ecclesiastical power, they have found it an inverted cone, to use his Lordship's simile, or rather *a broken reed, on which if a man leaneth, it will go into his hand, and pierce it.*

*Note*  
14.B.

But his Lordship finds himself safe, and is happy at taking his stand on very different ground—  
" his opinion has since received the sanction of  
" the Commons of Great Britain in the rejection  
" of a motion for the repeal of the Test-act."†

*Note*  
17

The contracted policy of excluding men from the service of their country, merely on account of religious opinion, was the institution of JULIAN the Apostate, and found its way from the heathen temples into christian churches, where it is fostered with peculiar care. Its origin cannot recommend it to his Lordship. And as so many *different* churches have adopted it, he will find it very difficult to prove, that such preference given to a favourite sect is an evidence either of the wisdom of government, or that the sect always deserves it.

History,

\* P. 10. note.

† Preface, p. 6.

History, which alone can be our guide, points out the reverse. After the Roman emperors became christian, such interference between different sects, first introduced strife and variance into the christian world, and was one great cause of their public misery, and of bringing on the decay, and at length the ruin of the empire.\*

*Note*  
18.

In later ages, such interference depopulated the finest provinces of Spain, and banished the Protestants from France, and brought on a desolation which neither of these kingdoms has recovered to this day. The miseries it occasioned formerly in our own country, though not so great, yet fill the mind with horror. Wholesome severities were once the delight of high-churchmen. And yet they can tell us on occasion, that any sort of inconvenience, or legal discouragement, which men well affected to government, are made to suffer on account of religion, is a degree of persecution. If so, his Lordship will consider under what description this Test-act will come; and if it is a degree of persecution, whether the sanction of the law, of which he boasts, and which continues this persecution, be a very honourable support of his principles. I need scarcely observe, what judgment we must form of the liberality of his Lordship's sentiments concerning the late repeal of the Test-act in this kingdom; for since the conduct of the English House of Commons is so highly pleasing to him, the generosity of the Irish legislature must, no doubt, have been altogether disgusting,

\* De la Grandeur des Romains & de leur decadence, par Montesquieu, c. xxii. Essai sur l'Histoire Universelle, par Voltaire. Foster's Voyages, p. 31, 32.



ing, as tending to undermine the *main column* of the church.\*

His Lordship is willing to allow the authority of King William, sometimes to be of weight. I know not whether it will alter his opinion of the wisdom of the British parliament in refusing to repeal the Test-act. His Majesty, in his speech to his first parliament, says, " he hoped  
 " they would leave room for the admission of *all*  
 " Protestants that were willing and able to serve,  
 " which conjunction in his service, would tend  
 " to the better uniting them among themselves,  
 " and strengthen them against their common ad-  
 " versaries."† But this wise and salutary advice was rejected; and the admission of Dissenters into offices was strenuously opposed, at that time, by the high-church party. And the English nation has never been able to rise superior to that ungenerous, unmanly policy, which still continues, and meets with the hearty approbation of the Bishop of Cloyne.

*Note  
 at the End,  
 page 8.*

A learned prelate has observed, that the *divine* principle of TOLERATION was long obstructed in its passage to the church of England, and how late soever it arrived amongst us, it is the most just of all public laws, and is certainly of heavenly original.§ This principle so noble in itself, and so honourable to those that maintain it, was felt with all its beauty by an Italian monk, and

\* " The Sacramental Test was looked on (by the Tories) as the chief security the church of England had." Burnet's Hist. ann. 1689. It would seem, in their opinion, they could not hope to support it by argument.

† Life of King William, p. 208.

§ Warburton's Doctrine of Grace, part II. p. 82, 86.

and pleaded for by him,\* near a century before it could gain admittance into the British Protestant church, among a people so enlightened, and so philosophical, who have taken the lead, in the most sublime sciences, of all the nations of the earth. And what shall we say, if the perfection of this principle, in its just extent, according to the idea of King William, should be derived to England from Roman Catholic countries. From the conduct of some of the greatest monarchs on the continent of Europe, if we may judge from appearances, there is reason to expect that this generous, liberal policy will soon be adopted by them, which will unite all their subjects in the service of their country, and admit Dissenters to all the offices of the state. The King of France, we are told, has recommended to the parliament of Paris, the restoring of the Edict of Nantes in favour of his Protestant subjects. In his address to parliament, he says, “ I will not permit the  
 “ holy religion, in which I have the happiness to  
 “ be born, to suffer the least diminution in my  
 “ kingdom; but I am of opinion that this same  
 “ religion *commands* me not to leave a part of  
 “ my subjects deprived of their *natural* rights,  
 “ and what the state of society promises them.”†  
 The Bishop of Cloyne, upon his principles, must condemn this measure as improvident and ill-judged policy—and no doubt, must think it the  
 “ duty,” which the clergy there owe “ to the  
 church and state,” to sound an alarm, that the  
 D church

\* Non si trovara mai, che Dia habbia fatto un precetto, che per adimplirlo bisogna pigliare la licenza da altri. La natura quando dà un fine, dà ancora tutte quelle potenze che sono necessarie per ottenerlo; et Dio darà un fine et un precetto, che non si possa essequire senza riconoscere in gratia dagli huomini? Questo è troppo grande inconveniente. Considerationi del Padre M. Paolo, p. 80, 81.

† King of France's Speech, delivered Nov. 19, 1787.



ing, as tending to undermine the *main column* of the church.\*

His Lordship is willing to allow the authority of King William, sometimes to be of weight. I know not whether it will alter his opinion of the wisdom of the British parliament in refusing to repeal the Test-act. His Majesty, in his speech to his first parliament, says, " he hoped  
 " they would leave room for the admission of *all*  
 " Protestants that were willing and able to serve,  
 " which conjunction in his service, would tend  
 " to the better uniting them among themselves,  
 " and strengthen them against their common ad-  
 " versaries."† But this wise and salutary advice was rejected; and the admission of Dissenters into offices was strenuously opposed, at that time, by the high-church party. And the English nation has never been able to rise superior to that ungenerous, unmanly policy, which still continues, and meets with the hearty approbation of the Bishop of Cloyne.

*Note  
 at the End,  
 page 8.*

A learned prelate has observed, that the *divine* principle of TOLERATION was long obstructed in its passage to the church of England, and how late soever it arrived amongst us, it is the most just of all public laws, and is certainly of heavenly original.§ This principle so noble in itself, and so honourable to those that maintain it, was felt with all its beauty by an Italian monk, and

\* " The Sacramental Test was looked on (by the Tories) as the chief security the church of England had." Burnet's Hist. ann. 1689. It would seem, in their opinion, they could not hope to support it by argument.

† Life of King William, p. 208.

§ Warburton's Doctrine of Grace, part II. p. 82, 86.

and pleaded for by him,\* near a century before it could gain admittance into the British Protestant church, among a people so enlightened, and so philosophical, who have taken the lead, in the most sublime sciences, of all the nations of the earth. And what shall we say, if the perfection of this principle, in its just extent, according to the idea of King William, should be derived to England from Roman Catholic countries. From the conduct of some of the greatest monarchs on the continent of Europe, if we may judge from appearances, there is reason to expect that this generous, liberal policy will soon be adopted by them, which will unite all their subjects in the service of their country, and admit Dissenters to all the offices of the state. The King of France, we are told, has recommended to the parliament of Paris, the restoring of the Edict of Nantes in favour of his Protestant subjects. In his address to parliament, he says, “ I will not permit the  
 “ holy religion, in which I have the happiness to  
 “ be born, to suffer the least diminution in my  
 “ kingdom; but I am of opinion that this same  
 “ religion *commands* me not to leave a part of  
 “ my subjects deprived of their *natural* rights,  
 “ and what the state of society promises them.”† The Bishop of Cloyne, upon his principles, must condemn this measure as improvident and ill-judged policy—and no doubt, must think it the  
 “ duty,” which the clergy there owe “ to the  
 church and state,” to sound an alarm, that the  
 D church

\* Non si trovara mai, che Dia habbia fatto un precetto, che per adimplirlo bisogna pigliare la licenza da altri. La natura quando dà un fine, dà ancora tutte quelle potenze che sono necessarie per ottenerlo; et Dio darà un fine et un precetto, che non si possa essequire senza riconoscere in gratia dagli huomini? Questo è troppo grande inconveniente. Considerationi del Padre M. Paolo, p. 80, 81.

† King of France's Speech, delivered Nov. 19, 1787.



church is in danger, and that the overthrow of the state is involved in it.\* But whether the liberality of a French parliament towards Protestant Dissenters, in adopting this measure recommended by their monarch, be greater than the liberality of an English parliament in rejecting a similar one recommended by King William, a little time will shew.

His Lordship will please to observe, that upon his principles, christians for the first three hundred years, ought not to have been trusted to serve the country. None but the priests of the heathen temples, and the idolatrous worshippers could be entitled to national confidence. And yet, if we can believe the concurrent testimony of church historians, and the apologists of those early ages, christians were entitled to the most perfect confidence of every government, under which they lived, though they were all Dissenters. But when by the indiscreet zeal of the emperors, the christian priesthood was advanced to opulence, and permitted to intermeddle in affairs of state, they quickly found out, as our established clergy have in modern times, that dominion was founded in grace.† The opposition, therefore, given by English legislators to the repeal of the Test-act is not dictated by political wisdom, but is the effect of ecclesiastical  
jea-

\* From a strict intimacy contracted with many French gentlemen of both religions, during a residence of several years in different parts of that kingdom, I can say from certain knowledge, that none are better subjects than the Protestants of France, as none are more zealous for the glory of their monarch, and the interest of their country. And they, that are acquainted with their history, know that it happened there, as in England, that they were driven into faction by persecution.

† St. Augustin.

jealousy infused into the minds of too many of them by an education ill directed.

It would seem, that his Lordship's opinion of the liberty of the press rests on the same foundation. One of his opponents had taken notice of certain evils, which he alleges, are occasioned by the established clergy. And I know not well how his Lordship's reflection on this is to be understood, where he says in a sort of dissatisfied tone, ("a *modest* observation for the member of a tolerated sect!")\*

*Note  
at the End,  
page 8.*

Does this mean, that we enjoy a precarious indulgence? Or, does it mean, that no evil can possibly arise from an established clergy? Or, that if evils do proceed from them, Dissenters may not, without a crime, take the liberty to point them out; and that none but themselves shall take cognizance of such evils?

An author that inquires into original principles, and the acts of ancient legislators, we might suppose to be acquainted with the acts of modern times, and to know, that what he calls a *tolerated* sect was an *established* one: for which it may be enough to refer him to an opinion of the first legal authority, that of Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, in his speech before the House of Lords of Great Britain, in the remarkable cause between the city of London and the Dissenters.†

*Notes  
35,  
50.*

The notion of, at least, two established churches in our country, may occasion some perplexity in his Lordship's scheme of ecclesiastical polity

D 2

and

\* Preface, p. 7.

† Lord Mansfield's Speech in an Appendix to Fourneau's Letters to Mr. Justice Blackstone, 1767.



and may make it necessary to enter into their different nature, and adjust their relative merit and importance—and inquire whether the *entire* constitution comprehends our establishment, equally with his own—and, then, whether our attachment to our own establishment, entitles us to an equal share of national confidence, as his attachment to his own.

His Lordship, having in this manner supported his principles, declaims against the “seditious demagogue—innovators—and shallow politician”<sup>\*</sup>—and at the same time complains, that he, himself, is “vilified.”

Here his Lordship lays himself too open. For how easy would it be to deal out such epithets in reply, were we disposed to use them. But to this we cannot stoop. I did expect to meet a learned, and ingenious adversary in fair argument, and wished to treat him with all that personal respect that is due to him, at the same time, that I was resolved to examine his principles and his reasoning, with becoming freedom and candour. He was called upon to review the subject, but this he has expressly declined. To the public an appeal has been made against his argument, in a question of political discussion, which involves in it a very extensive view of history. If he is unable to defend himself, and sinks under this argument—if this be vilifying—to whom is it to be imputed—to his Lordship, or to others? He was the aggressor, and has laid us under the necessity to vindicate ourselves; and if his Lordship is unequal to his own defence, his character as a man of letters and a politician unavoidably falls to the ground.

And

<sup>\*</sup> Preface, p. 11, 12.

And for the present, his Lordship must excuse us, if we consider in that point of view his reserve in “not attempting to confute *their* arguments, or even to rescue his principles from their misrepresentation—for that would be sacrificing his ease to no purpose.”\*

But how should this happen, if the matter is so plain as he would allege? It is certainly of great importance, and he acknowledges more than once that he wrote in haste, and that sufficient time was not allowed him to give it an adequate discussion; and it would seem, that some of his apologists are of the same opinion, and have offered an excuse for his performance as being done in haste, and to serve an urgent occasion.† On this account, there was the greater necessity of entering fully into the argument. For in a question of such magnitude, as, in his Lordship's judgment, to involve in it the safety of the state, his conduct ought not only to be free from censure, but as much as possible, from the suspicion of it. In the situation, then, in which he has placed himself, he should consider the conduct that is most becoming him as a gentleman, as a man of letters, and as a member of that august body of our legislature, in which he has the honour of a seat. He should think it a sacred duty as a clergyman, to remove the offence he has given to so numerous and valuable a body of his Majesty's subjects; and the more so, because of the high advancement he has been raised to in opulence and rank in this kingdom by the gracious favour of his sovereign. He came a stranger into our country, and without a competent knowledge of our history, and of the views and distinctions

\* Preface, p. 10.

† Dr. Stock's Reply, p. 4.



distinctions of parties amongst us, and without informing himself of the principles and character of Presbyterians, he has ventured to give an injurious representation of men, who with a noble pride, look upon themselves as the defenders and support of the constitution.

If this claim of the Presbyterians be founded in historical truth, it might have been thought that every friend of his country would have rejoiced to see the evidence of it laid before him, if before he was unacquainted with it. Yet the Bishop of Cloyne has met with some apologists, who appear willing to support him in his accusations against them. These are a few so far as I know, and a very few of the established clergy, "who have come forward in support of the  
" established church with so much ability, and  
" with so much credit to the clergy of that  
" church."\*

With what ability they have come forward, the public will judge. His Lordship may be thought too much a party to decide. But, why does he say, they "came forward in support of  
" the established church." It was not in support of her doctrine, or discipline, or worship. None of these had been called in question. Neither had the body of the people, who, it is said, compose the church, received any injury or wrong, from which they could be rescued by a few clergymen. They lived with Dissenters, as fellow-subjects, on a footing of mutual regard and attachment, which cements societies together, and forms that union by which every government is supported. What the established church is, which he says, they came forward to support, we wish  
to

\* Preface, p. 10.

to have explained, but none of these writers will gratify us. We have heard of disputes in the South of Ireland about payment of tithe. In laying an account of these disputes before the public, the Bishop of Cloyne took occasion to bring forward his scheme of ecclesiastical polity, very unnecessarily, it should seem, and to extend his censures to the Presbyterians of the North. Perhaps, it is this scheme that is dignified with the name of the established church. A device, which at various times, has met with admirable success, by blending mens' peculiar notions, or their personal interest, with the supposed interest of the *church*: thus working on the imaginations of men by a sort of magical influence, from the use of that mysterious word, which they cautiously avoid explaining, otherwise the charm might vanish.

*Note*  
41.

In the reign of Queen Anne, when the *alarm was sounded*, as has of late among us, the language of many in the British parliament was  
 “ that dangers were created by those very men,  
 “ who filled the nation with this outcry against  
 “ *imaginary* ones, while their own conduct pro-  
 “ duced *real* and threatening dangers. They  
 “ were declared to be enemies of the Queen, and  
 “ her government. And both houses in an ad-  
 “ dress, prayed her Majesty to order a prosecu-  
 “ tion according to law, of all who should be  
 “ found guilty of this offence.”\*

In an age that boasts so much of philosophy, and liberality of sentiment, it must appear strange that political principles should be tried by the standard of ecclesiastical opinions, or the distinc-  
 tions

\* Burnet's History of his Times, p. 261.



tions of religious party. This standard seemed to be laid aside at the ACCESSION of the present reigning family, and a very different measure of political principles to be adopted, by which *all equally good subjects* might be known; that is, an attachment to our constitution on the principles of the Revolution, and of the settlement of the House of Hanover on the throne. A standard most reluctantly submitted to by high-churchmen, and which some of them cannot yet comprehend.

I cannot help expressing my concern that any gentleman bred in Dublin College, but especially one that had the honour of being a fellow of it, should even in appearance, be wanting in this philosophical, liberal turn of mind, which is said to be characteristic of the present age—for I can scarcely persuade myself that it is more than an appearance, as it is so very different from the established character of that College; which for a long series of years, has been distinguished by a noble liberality of sentiment, congenial with the native generosity of our country and of the youth that adorn that seat of learning. So that if the generous, liberal character that marks that College, and which Dr. Stock tells us, is his natural temper, is warped, it can only happen by *professional* influence; and perhaps, there is no place, where this influence is so strongly marked as in the clerical profession.—Will my learned opponent allow me to make this apology for him, and accept of it in return for that which he has so kindly made for me—let me also express my acknowledgments of his personal civilities to me, and the offer of his acquaintance; and assure him that this must be very grateful to me, and that in the occurrences of life, I shall be happy to make

make the most suitable returns in my power. In the mean time, I shall make some observations on his book, because the Bishop of Cloyne has adopted it, and rested his defence upon it, otherwise in my judgment, it might be passed by without giving the worthy author the trouble of attending to an examination of it.

The first thing I would observe is, that the learned Doctor seems to be desirous of making an apology for the Bishop of Cloyne: but it is wrapped up in a sort of studied obscurity, so as hardly to be understood. But if he really thought that his Lordship had fallen into mistakes, by the necessity he was under of "bringing opinions forward with dispatch—with the hope of influencing the minds of an assembly actually sitting:" \* meaning, I suppose, our parliament: why did he not candidly specify these mistakes which he thought his Lordship had fallen into? One who wishes to write for the information of his country, would certainly write in a fair, open manner, and would not *seem* to defend *all* the assertions of his patron, at the same time that he appeared to be persuaded that *some* of them were not to be defended. But it does not appear that his Lordship thinks himself obliged to his advocate for this apology, because in the edition of his book which he has published since Dr. Stock wrote, we don't find that any correction is made of any of these inaccuracies.

I would next observe, that when Dr. Stock's REPLY was announced to the public, it was expected that he would, fairly, have entered into the subject debated with the Bishop of Cloyne—  
E
that

\* Dr. Stock's Reply, p. 4.



that he would have begun upon first principles—would have explained what the constitution is—and what is the *entire* constitution. That he would have explained the ecclesiastical establishment—told us what we are to understand by the word CHURCH—what is its religious, or moral, or political influence, which might entitle it to all this importance to which he would raise it in the state. His Lordship was called upon to tell us what he meant by the *church*; but has declined it, and yet complains that his principles are misrepresented, and will not attempt “even to rescue his principles from misrepresentation.”\* Such is his deference to the public. However, as this learned gentleman has taken his place, he might have defined it, which was the more necessary because it had been pointed out as a term of vague and uncertain meaning: but he, also, has declined it.

We know, that whatever this *established church* means, it depends upon an act of Parliament, which supposes the legislature to be already complete, and the constitution *entire*, before this church had a being. We know, it has been laid aside by act of Parliament as hurtful to the state, and hurtful to religion.—And, that this Parliament which abolished episcopacy, under so heavy a censure, consisted of men, who were members of this church, and had been educated in it. It has been argued, that this church is only matter of regulation, which may be altered, or improved, or laid aside, as being altogether dependent on the state, the child of the constitution, not a part of it, much less an *essential* part of it, by *natural* union; not supporting it, but supported by it.

A corporation.  
on. See page  
16, in the  
Notes.

A political

\* Preface, p. 10.

A political constitution may be easily described by political or learned men. Whence then, arises this mighty reserve in giving a description of this ecclesiastical establishment, considered "in a point of view merely political." Is it real, or is it only imaginary? If it has any thing real, and be of that great importance we are so often told of late, where does it exist? Does it exist in the clergy alone? It would seem not. Their claim has been already examined,\* and no *reply* made by which we may discern, even, their existence as a political body, vested with power. Is it in the laity?—But, perhaps, this is an improper way of speaking: it may, possibly, be a contradiction in terms, to speak of an ecclesiastical establishment of laymen: for in this dark, mysterious research, we tread on uncertain ground. We have called for direction in vain. The Bishop is silent—his apologist is silent, and leaves the question where he found it, involved in obscurity.

Is it a fair conclusion from hence, that neither of these learned men had formed any accurate scheme of ecclesiastical polity? If I might be allowed to give my opinion, I would say, that in my judgment, it appeared most evidently, the Bishop of Cloyne had never examined it.

My reason for saying so, is, that he has equally exulted in two constitutions directly opposite to one another: that is, the church of England when it was *popish*, and when it was *protestant*—at one time, in his opinion, friendly to liberty; and at another, as he expresses it, "a congenial system of arbitrary dominion:" for we have seen, that

E 2

he

\* Vindication, p. 4. 5, 6.



he speaks of the church established by MAGNA CHARTA, with the same high approbation, as he does of the church of England at any period since the Reformation.

At the memorable æra of MAGNA CHARTA, I have called the church of England *popish*; by which I understand something more than merely *Roman Catholic*. The one acknowledges the authority of the *see* of Rome; the other, along with that, acknowledges also the authority of the *court* of Rome. This latter, strictly speaking, I would call *popish*. And in this subjection, most certainly we shall find "a congenial system of arbitrary dominion." This was the system of the church of England at that period. And let it be remembered, that of this arbitrary, *popish* constitution, his Lordship has proclaimed his high approbation.

Note  
29.

Many Roman Catholic countries, however, have resolutely opposed the authority of the *court* of Rome, which is so much admired by a *protestant* bishop. For, not to mention France and Venice, which we have already taken notice of, we may observe that William the Conqueror and William Rufus opposed it in the most determined manner, and with success; at the same time that the Emperor of Germany, with all his power, was not able to maintain his independence, but in a manner the most degrading sunk under this dreadful power, so highly extolled by the Bishop of Cloyne.

The distinction here mentioned, should be carefully attended to, and thoroughly understood by

by those who would write of the *political* power of the church of Rome.\*

Dr. Stock does not appear to have been at any pains to remedy the defect of his patron, mentioned above. For neither has he offered to us any scheme of ecclesiastical polity, though it was so obviously necessary, and had been demanded in the most express manner. It would seem he had nothing less in his view. He appears to have formed no other scheme than to write an invective against the church of Scotland, which he has pursued at great length, and with no little acrimony, though it had no connection with the subject. This, and abusing the English Dissenters, takes up the greatest part of his book. And the authorities he has cited, come in so questionable a shape, that we could scarcely think they should find admittance. Deistical writers, and high-churchmen of noted virulence, as we shall particularly point out, heated with strife and contention, and the most unhappy spirit of faction,

\* They that wish to see this subject fully explained, may find it in several Italian writers; particularly in Father Paul's *Considerationi sopra le Censure*. Gregori Leti, *Ceremoniale Historico & Politico*. And among the French, Chancellor Gerson de *Potestate Eccles.* Car. Molinæus de *Monarchia*. Lechassierius de *Libertate Antiq. et Canon. Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ*, &c. *Mazuray, histoire de la France*.

How far the Bishop of Cloyne, and his advocates, in their observations on the church of Rome, appear to be well informed on the question of her jurisdiction, every one will easily judge who is acquainted with this subject. What the sentiments of the confederate Catholics of Ireland were on this matter in the last century, may be collected from their transactions with Rinuccini, the Pope's nuncio. What the claims of the court of Rome were, appears from the letter of Cardinal Pamfilio to the nuncio, and the treaty at Rome between the Pope and Sir K. Digby. Carte's *Life of Ormond*, vol. i. p. 578. King Charles's *Secret Transactions* with the Earl of Glamorgan, by Dr. Birch.

Note  
19.



faction, are the authorities, which the learned Doctor is chiefly delighted with.

Let me here expostulate with my learned opponent: would it not ~~not~~ have been more becoming one who was a friend to his country, and to the interest of christian societies, to have avoided entering into a dispute that could only tend to irritate different parties, and foment strife and division. And still more, ought not a clergyman to have considered it a sacred duty to promote peace, and to avoid that *odium theologicum*, which the Doctor is aware might be imputed to him, from his manner of carrying on a debate, that originated in party spirit, without any apparent utility to the state as its object.

The Bishop of Cloyne is not satisfied with exalting the hierarchy to a degree of political importance *essential* to the state, but he must depress others—in sounding an alarm, he and his assistants find it expedient to represent all ranks as combined against the church to bring on one common calamity. The laws are not executed—magistrates are unfaithful to their duty—but this is a small matter, government itself is arraigned as supine and inactive—the sword of justice is slow, and lingers in the hands of humanity—our general and his troops move slowly on—and all the while, the dues of the clergy are withheld—a sacrilege that threatens destruction to the whole empire. To rouse government from this lethargy, the mighty *political* importance of the hierarchy is displayed, and the numerous bodies of Dissenters are drawn out in dreaded array, all prepared for her destruction; and because of some riots in the South, his Lordship very *modestly* and *gravely* tells the Presbyterians  
of

of the North, that it is for their interest it should be proclaimed, that they cannot be entitled to national confidence.

Presbyterians have resented this as highly injurious: but, it seems, in the opinion of Dr. Stock, they are mistaken: for saith he, “jealous of  
“their character as loyal subjects, they have  
“caught the alarm, as if a writer whose acknow-  
“ledged abilities added even more weight to  
“his opinion than his place in the great council  
“of the nation, had held them forth to the  
“public and to government, as disaffected to our  
“*admired* constitution, and secretly wishing to  
“subvert it. That the Bishop of Cloyne had the  
“smallest intention to bring an accusation of  
“this high nature against so great a propor-  
“tion of his fellow-subjects, his Lordship might  
“be allowed to deny without further proof,  
“than by appealing to the uniform tenor of his  
“public and private conduct.”\*

I must own myself entirely at a loss to know what this means. We know that high station requires dignity of character to support it, and that by a different character men sink in public esteem in proportion to their high station. We know that distinguished abilities can only be supported by strength of argument; but to suppose that station, or acknowledged abilities will give weight to an opinion that cannot be supported by argument or historical truth, is a principle of reasoning I cannot understand. Neither can I understand what is meant by saying, “his Lord-  
“ship might be *allowed to deny* without further  
“proof, than by appealing to the uniform tenor  
“of his public and private conduct.” And the difficulty

\* Dr. Stock's Reply, p. 8.



difficulty is encreased if his Lordship has made no such *denial*, which I no where find. The reverse appears to be the case, for in the preface to his late edition, he again repeats the charge, which he is here represented as denying, and expressly mentions the "*dangerous tendency* (of their opinions) to the constitution.\*"

What judgment are we to form of the Bishop and his apologist? Dr. Stock urges his defence on a construction of his argument, which his Lordship flatly contradicts; and yet his Lordship adopts this defence, and throws himself upon it for support. How is it, that the public may ever hope to know the sentiments of these learned gentlemen? And what shall we think of such *inaccuracy* in speaking of principles, that are said to affect the existence of the state, and the happiness of thousands?

It is somewhat unaccountable, that on this part of the subject, which would seem to be a fundamental part of the scheme, the opinion of the learned Doctor should be so very opposite to that of his patron: embarked in the same cause, it might have been expected, that at least they would not have been contradictory.

Dr. Stock assures us, "the Romanist, the *Presbyterian*, are each indefatigably earnest to set up their own model."† The Bishop of Cloyne says the reverse, *their* principles do not, like those of the Roman Catholics, tend to set up, but merely to pull down, an ecclesiastical establishment."

Dr.

\* Preface, p. 3. † Dr. Stock, p. 10. 14.

Dr. Stock tells us, that to make a proffer of *their* own church, for the maintenance of “government, and the Protestant ascendancy—is a fear, which, the *alacrity* of the sect considered, I dare say not one of us churchmen ever entertained.”\* But the Bishop of Cloyne is sure of the contrary; for he says, “they reject the idea of any national church.”

Thus it is easy to see why these learned writers don’t choose to adduce facts, or go into argument, for it would not be easy to reconcile contradictory propositions. Assertions cost nothing: and in this way, every one may indulge his fancy.

Let me now call Dr. Stock’s attention to that passage, which he would *seem* to quote from me, and from whence he takes occasion to mention the *alacrity of the sect*, as he so handsomely expresses himself. Speaking of me, he says:

“He is not without *hope*, that the time may come, when the sins of the episcopal church being completed—the legislature shall again grow weary of her, and—abolish her as an enemy to the interest and happiness of the empire—then speaks of the anticipation of that golden period—and of triumphantly exclaiming: don’t be afraid,” &c.† And then follows the passage, which we have already taken notice, the Bishop of Cloyne has transcribed, and given as a quotation from me.

Our author after declaiming in this manner, for a page or two, goes on to ask; “at a time  
F “when

\* Doctor Stock, p. 10. 14.

† Ibid.



“ when his brethren were soliciting a repeal of  
 “ the test-act in England, could it be imagined  
 “ that wisdom would dictate to a dissenting mi-  
 “ nister the expedience of representing the Pres-  
 “ byterians as a class of men not likely to be sa-  
 “ tisfied with that concession, but looking for-  
 “ ward with *confident* expectation to a greater,  
 “ even to the *excision* of the present ecclesiastical  
 “ establishment ?”\*

What wisdom might dictate in the opinion of Dr. Stock, is one thing—what he represents as having been said, may be very different, indeed; and is totally different from what is written. Let any one read the passage as it stands in the *VINDICATION*, † which is too long to insert, and let him judge of the Doctor’s candour. And if he finds not a remote idea of that unmanly and illiberal *hope*, which no generous mind could conceive, and which no generous mind should impute; much less of “ looking forward with *con-  
 “ fident* expectation to the excision of the present  
 “ ecclesiastical establishment, and triumphing in  
 “ the anticipation of that golden period,” he may be, perhaps, not a little surprised how the worthy Doctor should think himself justified in such latitude of interpretation, and how the Bishop of Cloyne could have implicitly copied him. Therefore, the dissenting brethren in England did not run the smallest risque of being injured in their application to parliament, for I cannot think that there was *ingenuity* enough in that kingdom to have found out any thing at all similar to what our author’s penetration has been able to discover. When high-churchmen to serve their purpose, raised an imaginary cry formerly, as has  
 been

\* Dr. Stock’s Reply, p. 15.      † Ibid. 34. 35.

been done at present, that the church was in danger, they took care not to forget Dissenters. The Bishop of Cloyne has imitated these men most carefully: but his apologist must be very happy to know from such authority as is highly valued by him, that is, of one who had a seat in the great council of the nation, and of acknowledged abilities, that “ the Dissenters did not pursue any design contrary to the established church.” \*

But then, I have said, *if* it should appear eligible to the wisdom of government to change the ecclesiastical establishment—and *if* a national church be essential to the civil constitution, Presbyterians *might* disappoint the anxious fears of the Bishop of Cloyne for the safety of the state. And so his apologist finds that some claim of a political nature was set up—and that such event was *confidently* expected, in opposition to my most express declarations. May we here use his own words in reply to such hasty conclusions, that others besides “ college folks may have leave to quarrel a little with his logic, which seems to acknowledge no difference between a hypothetical proposition, and a simple one.” †

These gentlemen, however, don't understand irony. The subject of church power is too sacred for raillery. For *great is Diana of the Ephesians*, and may not be laughed at. She sits enthroned in mysterious darkness, with her guardians around her, stately and jealous, who incessantly cry, this is the Goddess that came down from Heaven—bring offerings to her shrine, all ye people. If these oblations are withdrawn, we sound an alarm,

F 2

full

\* Burnet's Hist. vol. ii. p. 393. † Dr. Stock, p. 18.



full of terror,—the church is in danger. Then the pillars of the state are shaken, and the *balance* of the world is overturned from its centre—and *by this craft we have our wealth*. So perfect is our institution, that the *unbeliever* and the *profane* may partake of our most sacred mysteries, without polluting them: and such is their transforming influence, that these men without *principle* may, then, be trusted “with perfect consistency of *principle*”—But, the ingenuous, who pass by to the temple of Virtue, and vainly sacrifice emolument to integrity, we declare to be unworthy of confidence. It is for *their* interest we proclaim, they cannot be trusted by the state. None are “entitled to national confidence” but the initiated, who pry not too near, but submit in silence, and bow down to *our altar* at an awful distance.

I must request the reader, if he thinks it material to have a just view of my argument, to turn to the passages referred to by the learned Doctor: he does not choose to quote my words, and his interpretation scarcely ever gives my sense. We shall have occasion to make the same observation of the freedom he has taken with some other writers, and particularly with Spotswood.

In regard to the passage I have cited from the Irish parliamentary debates, he says, “a heavy *accusation* this, which surely in common justice (to say nothing of humanity) ought to have been well inquired into, before it was produced against a body of men, esteemed a respectable part of the community.”\*

And yet in the place referred to I have brought no *accusation*. The opinion, only, of these distinguished

\* Dr. Stock, p. 16.

tinguished commoners is mentioned for the sole purpose of shewing the estimation in which they held the conduct of the national clergy, particularly in the counties they represented. To that it goes, and only to that: and if any thing can be, it is most undoubtedly full to the purpose, and shews that these gentlemen did not "esteem them a respectable part of the community."

"Non-residence (he says) is a fault, which no body imputes to the southern clergy."\* Here again he clashes with the Bishop of Cloyne; who not only acknowledges it, but attempts to apologize for it. The apology, and the insufficiency of it was considered in the VINDICATION,† of which the Doctor takes no notice. Nor does he take any notice of the argument deduced from Lord An—ly's speech, to prove that the ecclesiastical establishment is not *essential* to the state, and that there is no *natural* union between them. And yet that would seem more material in a REPLY than proclaiming skill in logic.

We doubt not, for we know that many "college folks" are acquainted with logic: but we apprehend that some of them can lead themselves astray, and attempt to lead others astray by their logic. Thus in the passage cited from the parliamentary debates, there is no *hypothetical* proposition, as our author would allege. The learned commoner does not say, as Dr. Stock has stated his argument; "If the clergy are "non-resident, they must be thought unjust "and oppressive."‡ But, *simply*, and absolutely, charges them with non-residence—describes in most pointed terms the evil effects of it—complains

note  
29.B.

\* Dr. Stock, p. 17. † *ibid.* 51. ‡ *ibid.* 18.



plains of the shameful negligence of the superiors of the church in not using their power of enforcing residence—speaks of taking that power out of their hands, and lodging it where it would be executed—says, that there was a mere nominal clergy, and so on. Here is nothing *hypothetical*, but a direct, and plain declaration of their neglect of duty. Where, then, is the want of *charity* and *candour*, with which the worthy Doctor would charge me, because I alleged, that *their conduct has sometimes been represented in parliament, by gentlemen of their own church, in a light not very honourable to them*; which are the words I have used. Or as the Doctor chooses to express it, “shewing how cheap the national clergy were held by gentlemen of their own communion.”\*

But he would invalidate the representation of these distinguished commoners, by adducing the report of the committee of the House, “that complaint was made of exorbitant and illegal demands of the clergy, but it does not appear that their demands were either exorbitant or illegal.”†

How did our learned author’s logic lead him to this conclusion—their demands were not illegal—therefore the charge of non-residence was not true—therefore the two members that spoke against the conduct of the bishops and the clergy, did not think dishonourably of them!

Let us take another specimen of it: “little attention, it seems, is due to the outcry “of the church of Ireland.”‡ Why? because I had

\* Dr. Stock, p. 18. † Ibid, p. 17. Ibid, p. 16.

had said, *the nation is not so blind, as to think the STATE is in the smallest danger from the distresses of the South.* The event shews which of us argued best, and which of us entertained the justest and most honourable opinion of government, the bishop and his apologist, who distrusted it, or we who placed the fullest confidence in its power and stability.

But, where is this *church* of Ireland, that had made this outcry? Where did this *political* body assemble for the occasion, and by what authority—or what is it?—Is it the Bishop of Cloyne—or, is it a few of his clergy—or, a few men immured within the walls of a college, that our learned author has conjured up into the *church* of Ireland? And are we thus gratified, at length, with a description of this ecclesiastical establishment, which we have hitherto so earnestly called for in vain? And is this that important political institution, that forms the balance of the state, the existence of which is so *essential* to it, that its overthrow would necessarily subvert the civil constitution?—In this manner, is the public entertained with *words*, that convey no meaning.

The revenues of the crown may be intercepted—this church makes no outcry, as if the state was therefore in danger. But, if the dues of a few clergymen are curtailed, the empire suffers a convulsion. For the safety of the empire is their great concern. And what is still worse, the Protestant religion is annihilated. What happens in Ireland, is only the beginning of sorrow—the evil will reach England instantly—“the moment is critical”—it is already there in idea, and is stretching over the continent of Europe,  
and



and all is laid in ruins——“ it is decisive of the Protestant interest.”

But this concern for the general safety of the Protestant religion, however laudable in itself, may be laid aside, as ill-founded, and no longer useful, having served the purpose of declamation. Its security does not depend on the payment of tythe, no more than the safety of the state; nor is it any how connected with it. It does not depend on any *particular* form of church government. It is not bishops and archbishops that are the bulwark against Popery: it is not their revenues, their lands, or tythes, nor their hierarchy, for these would rather lead back to Rome, from whence they originated——the political importance of the ecclesiastical establishment has nothing to do with them. It consists in the *independency* of the state on any foreign power or jurisdiction. It is the government being complete and entire over all persons ecclesiastical as well as civil, free from subjection to any exterior human laws or constitutions. In this view, the King being supreme head of the church, secures the independency of the realm in all matters ecclesiastical.

Laws, or creeds, enacted by a general council, or at Rome, or any part of the world, are not binding unless by consent of the nation in parliament. No appeals to the court of Rome, which the Bishop of Cloyne so much praises, at an early period, as establishing the liberties of the church of England. All this is asserted, and explained by our first reformers, and by several statutes at the Reformation: \* with all which his  
Lord-

\* 24 Hen. 8. c. 12. 25 Hen. 8. c. 21. 26 Hen. 8. c. 1.

Lordship, being appointed, as he says, guardian of the church, ought to be well acquainted.

So that while the independency of our government remains, and an *internal* jurisdiction is maintained in every thing relative to religion, Popery can never get footing. But, let these be taken away; and let the hierarchy remain: let archdeacons, deans, and chapters, bishops and archbishops remain, and we have no sure defence against Popery. For it is well known, that this government is perfectly consistent either with the French or Italian model. It was derived from that source, and not as his Lordship asserts from our civil constitution; as every one knows, who is but moderately versed in ecclesiastical history. And we may quote his own authority here against himself: as he refers us for that exact conformity between the ecclesiastical and civil constitution, to the period when the church of England was subject to the papal authority, which held England in such servitude as the Gallican church would never allow, as we have seen, nor the state of Venice. And therefore what he calls a congenial system of *arbitrary* dominion could not be formed on the model of a *free* state; though in his judgment they were precisely the same.\*

Our established clergy, considered as a body vested with peculiar privileges, are not, and never have been, a defence of the Protestant religion. Many individuals of this church, laity as well as clergy, have distinguished themselves in a manner very honourable to themselves, and advantageous to the christian world. And we gladly pay that tribute of praise which is due to such

G

excellent

\* Bishop of Cloyne, p. 10, 11.



excellent men. But it is obvious, that the advantages derived to the state, or to the interest of the Protestant religion, did not proceed from any political incorporation, but from their personal character, their learning and eminent abilities.

From this view of the ecclesiastical polity established in England, we shall make the following observations.

1. That, the clergy, as a body vested with political power, have no existence. It must, therefore, be nugatory to speak of them as a constitution *essential* to the state, or to the Protestant religion, either at home, or abroad. The main thing, then, to be proved by our high-churchmen, is, that the clergy do form such a political body; and that we have not given a just view of the subject.

2. That, the established clergy not being essential to the state, or to the security of the Protestant religion, much less can their maintenance, in any particular mode, be essential to either.—Therefore, in this political view, it must be immaterial, whether their lands and tythe be resumed by government—or whether the clergy be paid out of the public treasury, as in some countries of Europe at present, and as was done at first by Constantine\*—or whether they be supported as in the early christian church, and at present among Dissenters, by voluntary contribution.

3. That

\* 'Εκ δὲ τῆς αἰσῆς ὑποφόρου γῆς, καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν ἐξελών τε δημοσίᾳ ρητόν τέλος, ταῖς κατὰ τόπον ἐκκλησίαις καὶ κληροῖς ἀπενείμει, καὶ τὴν δωρεάν εἰς τὸν ἀπαντὰ χρόνον κυρίαν εἶναι ἐνομοθετήσας. Sozomen. Hist. Eccles. p. 412, 600.

3. That, the independence of the ecclesiastical constitution being settled by several statutes, is maintained by the King in person, or present in his courts of law and of chancery, or by parliament, but in no sort by the clergy in any political capacity. So that to sound an alarm, that the state, and ecclesiastical constitution, and the Protestant religion at home and on the continent of Europe, was in danger, because payment of tythe was disputed at Cloyne, was a mere delusion, and abusing the public ear, and shews plainly that this is a subject that has been entirely mistaken by the Bishop of Cloyne and his apologists.

4. That, the guardians of civil liberty are, in our constitution, the same as the guardians of religious liberty; that is, the King's Majesty, the parliament, and our courts of law. So that when the bishop calls himself, in a sort of appropriated sense, a *guardian* of the ecclesiastical establishment, it is not easy to understand what he means by it. For, if he means that he and the rest of the bishops are guardians of the church, if he will condescend to explain himself, and enter into an examination of the grounds of this high claim, it may be found, perhaps, that our constitution admits of no such thing, but that they, themselves, as bishops, are under *guardianship*. And that as lords of parliament, they only partake of a certain power in common with others. And that every member of the House of Commons, in a political view, as well as of the House of Peers, is equally a guardian with his Lordship.

5. That, the Test-act can give no security to our ecclesiastical constitution; because all Pro-



testants are agreed in supporting its independence on any foreign power, whether of the Pope or general Council. And, if there be any difference among the different Protestant churches in this respect, which at some times has appeared in the history of England, then we might be warranted in asserting, that Presbyterians have been more firmly determined to support this independence than high-churchmen, and therefore are so much more the friends of this *entire* constitution than they are. So that the enacting the Test-act at first against Protestant Dissenters, and the continuing of it, was not the dictate of an enlightened policy, but the remains of religious intolerance, which has a tendency to weaken the hands of government. This, we have already observed, was the sentiment of King William; and it was the sentiment of that illustrious statesman, the late Lord Chatham, delivered in parliament in the year 1773, when he shewed himself a zealous friend, and a most intelligent and able advocate of the English Dissenters, in their application for a repeal of the Test-act. In answer to the Archbishop of York, who had called the Dissenting Ministers, men of *close ambition*, his Lordship replied, that "it was an accusation  
 " of a most respectable body without any evi-  
 " dence, and therefore an open defamation. That  
 " the gentlemen on whom it was cast, had no  
 " ambition but to learn and teach the will of  
 " their divine Master, to follow the college of  
 " fishermen, not of cardinals and bishops. This  
 " was the great offence they had given to many." Speaking further on the ill effects of all religious establishments and tests, and their inconsistency with the different measures of mens' understandings, their progress in knowledge and their sincerity,—then addressing himself particularly to  
 the

the Archbishop, he closed with these remarkable words:—"As for our church, we have Calvinistic articles, Arminian preachers, and a Popish liturgy."

With much concern, we saw these just and liberal sentiments deserted in the late debate, by his son, who inherits so many of his father's virtues.

6. That, from this view of the ecclesiastical polity of England, we may perhaps be led to understand the observation of the philosophic politician speaking on this subject, where he says—"The clergy, not being able to protect religion, nor to be protected by it, only seek to persuade: their pens, therefore, furnish us with excellent works in proof of a revelation, and of the providence of the supreme Being.\*"

7. That, from hence we may discern the reason, that neither the Bishop of Cloyne, nor any of his apologists, have been able to point out in any one instance, the utility of the *supposed political* institution of their church—nor have attempted to shew its superior utility to that of the Presbyterian, in inculcating the duties of religion, and of social life, which are the only useful effects the Bishop has mentioned of ecclesiastical establishments. Our worthy Doctor, however, seems to put on a dissatisfied air, in speaking of the Address of the Southern Presbytery, though they "pretend to no more than an equality with us," as he expresses it, "in decorous conduct."†

But

\* Montesquieu, L'Esprit de Loix, tome i. p. 416.

† Dr. Stock, p. 20.



But though they pretend to no more, than to allege, " that religion is as diligently taught by " lowly Presbyters, as by a mitred bishop," yet learned men of this church have said a great deal more. Dr. Edwards has said, that the existence of the Protestant religion in England was owing to their teaching. And we have the authority of a mitred bishop in their favour, from which, in the opinion of the learned Doctor, it should seem, there ought to be no appeal. And this prelate has given not merely an *equality*, but a striking preference: for in his judgment, " The Dissenters " have a much larger share of knowledge among " them, than is among those who come to our " churches. I say it with great regret, I have " observed the clergy in all the places through " which I have travelled, Papists, Lutherans, " Calvinists, and Dissenters; but of them all, " our clergy," saith his Lordship, " is much the " most remiss in their labours in private, and the " least severe in their lives."\* And we are told by the writer of his life, that this bishop conversed much with Dissenters, and was zealous to bring them into the pale of the church, notwithstanding his acknowledgment that they were better taught by their own pastors.

The learned Doctor has also taken offence at the Address from Londonderry. Solicitous to defend his patron, in words at least, he would support his pleasing dream of ecclesiastical power, as if it were the cause of the church, which now appears to mean nothing more than a few of the clergy. Of the laity he makes no account, further than by working on their passions, in the best manner he can, to make them, and even govern-

\* Burnet's History of his Times, vol. ii. p. 384, 387.

vernment, subservient to the temporal greatness of episcopacy, and the wealth of ecclesiastics. To this purpose is that florid declamation in his postscript, that “ there is *still resident* in too many breasts in this country a fund of combustible matter, ready, without great watchfulness on the part of our rulers, to take fire to the ruin of the present establishment.”

From the first settlement of Presbyterians in Ireland, for the space of near two centuries, he has not been able to produce one historical fact, that could justify this ungenerous accusation. And where does he search for proof of this mighty danger that threatens ruin?—Why, truly, Presbyterians, it seems, were offended at the aspersions thrown on them—they express their sense of this injurious treatment—and this he chooses to call “ inflammatory.”

A right ~~hon.~~ prelate has represented them as Rev.<sup>d</sup>  
men who are not entitled to national confidence—as only waiting for a safe opportunity to overturn the constitution: but this is nothing—it is no just provocation—there is not even a thought of depressing their reputation! What shall we say of this? Shall we call it laughing at a public interest, or being insensible of public character? Or that certain men, basking in the sunshine of prosperity, think they have a privilege of saying things the most offensive, with impunity? That rank, and I know not what moral and intellectual abilities may be pleaded in defence of the most injurious conduct?—it matters not, if government may, possibly, be deceived; or the interest of our country, possibly, destroyed. The friends of the constitution must submit tamely to be insulted. They must not  
justify



justify themselves : that is a crime ; it is a symptom of disloyalty and disaffection, of which our rulers must be warned, lest the nation be set in a flame.

And is it our national character to be insensible of honour ? The learned Doctor was born in Ireland, and he might know whether Irishmen are apt tamely to take an affront. The world thinks otherwise. If this be characteristic of individuals, need it be wondered at, if the body of Presbyterians, and particularly that the MEN of DERRY, should be jealous of their honour and their character, when so highly impeached by a *stranger*, unacquainted with their principles and their history.

But in regard to this “ fund of combustible matter ready to take fire,”—I would recommend it to the worthy Doctor to turn his eyes nearer home, and he can be at no loss to know in what quarter the present flame was kindled. A prelate of no little fame, speaking “ of the established clergy, in the present condition of things,” says, “ that if any stale particles of the *old leaven* still remain, they lie perfectly inactive.”\* And this he speaks to their *honour*. Whether he would have thought, that the conduct of some of the clergy in Ireland shewed that the “ particles of the *old leaven*” did not “ lie perfectly inactive,” we will not say : but in answer to this imputation against our character, unsupported by facts, we might use the words of Lord Chatham, recited above, that “ it is an accusation of a most respectable body “ without any evidence, and therefore an open “ defamation.”

\* Warburton's Doctrine of Grace, part ii. p. 84.

“defamation.” But, this might perhaps be too strong language from us, and might be brought as an exception to that moderation, which the worthy Doctor is kind enough to allow me, and which he alleges I have deviated from in a quotation from Montesquieu.

But, as I would not wish, in any instance, to deviate from that character, and from the respect that is due to the public, so I would observe, that it is very possible a man may be guilty of such conduct as deserves severity of censure, and that a just severity of censure may be conveyed in a calm, temperate manner. Such I apprehend is the case in the passage objected to. I must, therefore, appeal from the Doctor’s critical taste to the public, who will determine.

The learned Doctor goes on: “People ought  
“to receive with caution what a right rev. pre-  
“late has attested concerning the risings and tu-  
“mults in Munster.”

In my observations on the Bishop of Cloyne, I had said, “your want of information in re-  
“gard to the principles and conduct of the Pres-  
“byterians of Ulster, where you lived so long,  
“will induce them to receive with caution *all*  
“that you have said concerning the risings and  
“tumults of Munster.” And here I will add, that the propriety of such caution still continues. What occurred in the House of Commons during last session of parliament confirms it. The speeches of some of the southern members confirm it. And it is still further confirmed by the friends of the Bishop and his clergy, industriously keeping back a parliamentary inquiry into the causes and *extent* of those tumultuous  
H . risings,



risings, though this was repeatedly demanded by gentlemen, who asserted that the accounts were much exaggerated. Besides, other publications have since appeared that charge his Lordship's account with being partial and defective;\* and their authority, so far as I know, has not been controverted. Neither has his apologist offered any thing to induce us to lay aside our caution, except it may arise from the *rank* of the author, which, on several occasions, is brought forward with ostentation, and as matter of great weight in argument. And to men trained up in certain habits of thinking, it is said, none are so convincing.

This is the sum of what the learned Doctor has offered in defence of his patron. And it is easy to observe, he has not at all entered into the argument. He has repeated what the Bishop of Cloyne has said about an *entire* constitution, but has carefully avoided answering the objections that I have offered against this fanciful notion. Nor has he attempted to answer any one material argument brought against this scheme. To what, then, it may be asked, is his reply directed? Or with what propriety, has he called it a **REPLY TO THE VINDICATION OF THE PRESBYTERIANS OF IRELAND?** It was well the title page told us so, for we should have looked for it in vain in his book: the greatest part of which is evidently,

\* The Roman Catholic clergy are said to have suffered in their persons and property by these tumultuous riots, equally with the established clergy. See Dr. Butler's Justification, &c. in answer to the Bishop of Cloyne, section i. And it would appear, that these disturbances originated in the extreme poverty and misery of the lowest class of people; who in a riotous and illegal manner fought for relief of their wretchedness.

ly, as appears to me, written in support of my principles—a very small part in support of the the Bishop of Cloyne. And as to particular facts, it will easily occur to any who will be at pains to examine, that he contradicts his Lordship as often as he contradicts me. But this is immaterial. The management was to introduce some other subject, that had at least a nominal resemblance of the question in debate, and to blend them together so as to carry off the attention from the main argument.

Something was thought necessary to support, in appearance at least, his Lordship and his positions concerning the political importance of the hierarchy. The solid advantages they enjoy from their ample revenues, are not enough to satisfy ambitious churchmen. Power is their aim. They aspire to the character of statesmen, and fly from the duties of the pastoral office to engage in the arduous affairs of government: and think not that this is a desertion of their sacred duty.

To carry on our author's purpose, he soon loses sight of the argument debated with the Bishop, and introduces a new subject. He proposes to enter into a "*serious* inquiry, whether there " is any reason to *expect* an event, which no human being *expects*, beside a Presbyterian, that " the religion of Scotland should once more be- " come the established religion of the British " empire.\*

What *expectation* our author speaks of, and where he has met with it, he does not tell us, therefore it is needless to conjecture. The Presby-

H 2

terian

\* Dr. Stock's Reply, p. 18, 19.



terian church, we know, was established in England in the last century. But Presbyterians, at that time, did not at all *expect* it. For it is remarkable, that presbytery was, then, established by an episcopal parliament. To the transactions of that parliament I would refer him for satisfaction in answer to his question concerning the "sources of persuasion sufficient to induce England" to substitute Presbyterian church in the room of prelacy, which they "found intolerable in the last century." And if he examines accurately, he will find that "the subversion of the "episcopal church" was not "connected with "the subversion of the state," as he alleges, but was the means of saving it from ruin. And that so long as the Presbyterian church continued, the constitution was supported with dignity and with vigour; and that the subversion of this church was connected with the subversion of the state.

A particular account of this memorable transaction is given in the VINDICATION, which has not been controverted. But it is there said, that "if this church should *unhappily*, at any time "hereafter, give reason to *her chief members*, "among our nobility and commoners, to censure her conduct with such severity—it might "again be abolished."\* Perhaps this is the *expectation* referred to. But let us attend to what a bishop has said on this subject: "The violences "of Archbishop Laud, and his promoting arbitrary power, ruined himself and the church "both. A return of the like practices will bring "with it the like dreadful consequences."† Does Dr. Stock suppose the bishop expected, or *hoped*, that

\* Vindication, p. 34, 37.

† Burnet's Hist. vol. ii. p. 386.

that this revolution would take place? And are not his expressions as pointed as any I have made use of? But whatever the bishop's hopes, or fears might have been, it is certain he did not think the Presbyterians expected, or hoped for any such thing: for he says, "it is visible the Dissenters acquiesce without pursuing any design contrary to the established church." But he tells us, a little after, that "the Tories tried to raise a heat against the Dissenters, to make a breach on the TOLERATION, and to give that body of men such a jealousy of the government, as should quite dishearten them, who were always the readiest to lend money to the public—and who concurred zealously in serving all the ends of the government. So that nothing can keep up any heat in those matters but the *folly* and *bad humour* that the clergy are possessed with, and which they infuse into all those with whom they have credit."\* — Thus far the prelate, in his observations on the conduct of the clergy in Queen Anne's reign. Whether any of these reflections be applicable to the clergy who have agitated the present question, every one will easily determine.

But whoever are the expectants of a change, whether those who think with Bishop Burnet, or any others, our author thinks it of importance to consider, "whether our political constitution might be *improved*, by substituting in place of the present ecclesiastical establishment of England and Ireland, either the Presbyterian or Independent model of church polity." This, if I understand it right, is a just statement of his inquiry, and of his "historical excursion," as he calls it: which takes up almost the whole of his pamphlet from page 18th.

But,

\* Burnet's hist. vol. ii. p. 227, 260, 393, 394.



But, how did the argument with the Bishop of Cloyne lead to this view of the subject? It would seem, that it did not, even, admit of it, without first overturning his Lordship's principles, or acknowledging that they were not to be defended. He had asserted, that the civil constitution can have no existence but in conjunction with the present ecclesiastical establishment, for the union is *natural* and *essential*. The learned Doctor proposes to consider, whether our civil constitution might be *improved* by substituting any other church in place of the present: that is, he proposes to consider of the improvement of a thing, which upon his Lordship's principles cannot exist. His inquiry proceeds upon the supposition that a *natural* and *essential* union is dissolved, which does not merely injure, but destroy the constitution. So that the subject is either wide of the purpose, or in direct opposition to the assertions of his patron.

As his apologist differs from his Lordship in those principles, that are called essential and fundamental, and yet would seem to support them—and with which support or subversion his Lordship is very well satisfied—it need not be wondered at that he should write what he calls a REPLY to the VINDICATION, and carefully avoiding the arguments, should direct his discourse to what is no where to be found in it. I have no where entered into the question, whether our political constitution would, or would not, be improved by substituting another church in place of the present hierarchy. But, I have said, that no particular ecclesiastical establishment is *essential* to our constitution: this his Lordship's argument directly led to. I have said, that it is the wisdom of government not to establish any *political* institution

stitution of religion. I have said, that our constitution would be feeble, indeed, if its existence depended either on your's, or our church government, or on any other. I have gone further, I have said, that churchmen of whatever denomination should, as a body, have no political existence. And that it is dangerous to trust power in the hands of ecclesiastics of any denomination.\*

Certainly there is no power claimed here, either for Presbyterians, or Independents: therefore there is no room, in the present debate, for examining the question concerning the relative character of these churches, and the episcopal, or of supposing that they should have a political establishment, which is so expressly disavowed.

However, let us attend to our author, and since he has introduced the subject, we are not at all solicitous to evade the inquiry, being of opinion that it will turn out little to the honour of his hierarchy.

In discussing this very important question, he finds the Union a barrier of the church. It is plain, that this proves no superior merit, because by that Union, the Presbyterian church was, also, established in Scotland. The Bishop of Cloyne had found the coronation oath a security "to preserve to the bishops and clergy, and to the churches committed to their care, all such rights and privileges, as by law do, or *shall*, appertain to them, or any of them."†

*Note*  
20.

*Note*  
21.

What these privileges *shall* be, we cannot tell: but we see there is abundant latitude given for al-

\* Vindication, p. 6, 12, 27, 69.

† Bishop of Cloyne, p. 11, 12.



Note  
20.

alterations. And these are numerous. New acts of parliament are frequently enacted, and large grants of money made every session for the benefit of the church, or the clergy. These grants are not, all, sufficient, in the opinion of the Bishop of Cloyne. He thinks more money, and more land, still necessary. These, however, change the state of the church and clergy, by rendering them more opulent and powerful. Is this a violation of that clause of the act of Union mentioned by our author, "that the then establishment of the church in England and Ireland shall be maintained and preserved *inviolably* for ever."\* If the then establishment was perfect, why is it altered? If it was imperfect, must it, or must it not, remain in its imperfection by the Union? We know that the Bishop of Cloyne has an entire section on "the defects of the settlement of the church of Ireland," all of which he would have reformed, so that we do not understand what that establishment is, which "shall be preserved *inviolably* for ever."

But the act of Union is not of that inviolable nature, in the esteem of these gentlemen, that they would pretend. They only mean, that except it serves their purpose, it may not be altered. At other times, they are highly pleased with the violation of it. Dr. Stock, who finds it a certain barrier of the privileges of his church, changes his mind in regard to its sacred nature, and thinks the breach of it in the church of Scotland just and laudable. "By the act of x. Anne, c. 12. the ancient rights of patrons in that part of Great Britain, called Scotland, were restored, and the crown was again put in possession of the right of presentation to all livings formerly in the gift of bishops, &c."†

This

\* Dr. Stock, p. 19. † *ibid.* p. 49.

This was a direct violation of the act of Union. For when Presbytery was established in Scotland by an act of King William, the principle set up by Presbyterians from the beginning, was secured to them, which was also the practice of the early christian church, even after it was established, that parishes had a right to choose their ministers. This privilege was taken away by the act of Queen Anne, which was opposed by the nation, as an invasion of their constitution, and a breach of the Union;\* but this meets with the Doctor's full approbation. For he says, " what the times would not permit King William to rectify, was placed on a *proper* footing in the reign of his successor."†

The Bishop of Cloyne alleges, that the ecclesiastical establishment maintains the *balance* of the state. What the *balance* is, and how it is maintained, he has not told us. But might it not occur to him, that there was danger of destroying this balance by an encrease of opulence and power, and thereby injuring or destroying the state? Is not the danger as great, as by a diminution of their opulence and power? It would seem so in the opinion of our author, who acknowledges, that " churchmen of all denominations have been apt to make an ill use of power, when trusted with too much of it."‡ And yet on this account we hear of no *outcry* from these patriotic gentlemen, who profess so much zeal for the *entire* constitution of these realms.

But perhaps, the church is justified in taking all she can get, and the *balance* of the constitution is more secure in proportion as the clergy are  
I more

\* Burnet, vol. ii. p. 356.

† Dr. Stock p. 49. ‡ Ibid. 107.



more opulent—and what is once gotten must be preserved inviolably by the Union : and this, perhaps, may extend also, to the power and privileges granted to the church. But we know the Vestry-act was repealed, and the Union was not affected. Nay more, the Test-act in this kingdom was repealed, and the Union was not broken, though that act was prior to it. But as these acts had no reference to the power or dues of the clergy, perhaps they had no reference to the church ; as it seems, the clergy are the church. It is true the established doctrine speaks a different language, it calls the *church* a congregation of faithful men ; with what propriety, then, the clergy call themselves the church, who make so small a part of a congregation, we cannot tell ; in vain have we asked for information.

It may be equally difficult to ascertain the rights and character of a bishop in our established church. Some maintain a *divine* right of episcopacy, derived by uninterrupted succession from the Apostles through the church of Rome ; and that in virtue of this succession they are only clothed with the episcopal character ;\*—others, again, express their wonder, that those “ who  
 “ plead that the government of the church is  
 “ settled by *divine* authority in the bishops, can  
 “ yet by the virtue of papal bulls, confirmed by  
 “ an unhappy clause in an act of parliament, exercise  
 “ episcopal jurisdiction : which is plainly to  
 “ act by virtue of the secular power, in opposition  
 “ to that, which, according to their principles,  
 “ is settled by *divine* appointment.”†

Others.

\* See, episcopacy by *divine* right asserted, by Bishop Hall. The sacred order and offices of episcopacy by *divine* institution, by Bishop Taylor.

† Burnet's History of his Times, vol. ii. p. 384.

Others say, that by the exprefs letter of the statute, all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction, in the church of England and Ireland, flows from the King's majesty. That by the constitution of this church, the Lord Chancellor might be appointed to perform all the episcopal duties of the Lord Primate, and the judges of the bishops. But why do I speak of men of eminent station : any layman may be appointed by the King's commission to do every act of the episcopal office. This is the present ecclesiastical constitution. Now, let me ask, is this the constitution that the Bishop of Cloyne contends to be *essential* to the state, so that the state cannot exist without it ? And if any one should deny this, and hold an opinion that episcopal authority in the church of England, was not derived from the crown, but was derived from another source, flowing through the church of Rome, would that person be deemed an enemy to the entire constitution, and not to be trusted in consistency of principle ?

High-churchmen, we know, have held these principles. They assert that kings have not a spiritual authority over the church : that Christ committed to bishops, as successors of the Apostles, the chief government of his church : that the King being supreme governor in all causes, as well *spiritual* as temporal, means that his power, in what cause soever, is only *temporal* : that the supreme power of this realm claims no other than a civil authority.\* This is in direct opposition to the King's supremacy, for the law that recognizes it, 26 Hen. 8. c. 1. enacts, that the King shall have full power and authority to

I 2

visit,

\* Dr. Brett on the Independency of the Church, p. 21, 35.



visit, reform, order, and correct all such errors, heresies—and enormities whatsoever they be, which by any manner of *spiritual* authority or jurisdiction, ought or may lawfully be reformed, &c.

Queen Elizabeth did not like this spiritual authority at first. She would not be called head of the church: that was a dignity unbecoming any mortal to assume, and should be given only to Jesus Christ. However, she afterwards became better reconciled to it, and made her bishops and clergy, and even her parliament, feel all the weight of it.

In this variety of opinion, we see how necessary it is, that the Bishop of Cloyne, or his apologists, if they aim at giving information, should lay before us a certain, determinate scheme of ecclesiastical polity. Because inferences of a very different, and opposite nature will follow, according as they may adopt one or other of these different systems. But instead of entering into a full examination of the subject, we are entertained with general declamation, or with particular circumstances that sometimes give no very favourable opinion of the hierarchy.

Such as when Dr. Stock offers it as a reason in support of the present established church, that the crown will hardly be induced “to part with  
“ *a considerable share of influence* in the House of  
“ Peers.”

Whether this language be very honourable to the right reverend bench, is easy to judge. It certainly holds them out in a very different point of view from the hereditary nobility; whose dignity

nity would be debased by such a representation. The importance of that noble order in our admired constitution, is to support the rights both of the crown, and of the people, by forming a barrier to withstand the encroachments of either.

It has often been objected against the bishops having seats in parliament, that their influence in the House of Lords was hurtful to the constitution. To this Dr. S. would reply by boldly proclaiming the fact, and would seem to place the security of the order upon the abuse of their privilege—acknowledging with apparent satisfaction that they act under the *influence* of the crown. *Note 15. at the End*  
 This is paying them a bad compliment; and *Note 5. page 17.*  
 would seem to represent them as unworthy of a seat in that august assembly, as being creatures of the crown, depending upon it, and therefore not supporting the dignity of lords of parliament. Is not this, indirectly, accusing them as unworthy of the honourable rank to which they are advanced—as betraying the high trust committed to them, as counsellors of the crown. Is *Note*  
 it not representing them as men, whose judgment was biassed and corrupt; and that though they ought to be directed by integrity, and an awful regard to truth, and justice, and the prosperity of the kingdom, yet that the interest of the empire, at large, was not their concern, being devoted to a *part* of it, and therefore not friends of the *entire* constitution. Is it not censuring them, as if they made the most unworthy return to his Majesty for the confidence he has placed in them, by raising them on account of their supposed integrity and wisdom, to sit with princes in the great council of the nation, to deliberate on the weighty affairs of government, and to assist him by faithful advice.

May



visit, reform, order, and correct all such errors, heresies—and enormities whatsoever they be, which by any manner of *spiritual* authority or jurisdiction, ought or may lawfully be reformed, &c.

Queen Elizabeth did not like this spiritual authority at first. She would not be called head of the church: that was a dignity unbecoming any mortal to assume, and should be given only to Jesus Christ. However, she afterwards became better reconciled to it, and made her bishops and clergy, and even her parliament, feel all the weight of it.

In this variety of opinion, we see how necessary it is, that the Bishop of Cloyne, or his apologists, if they aim at giving information, should lay before us a certain, determinate scheme of ecclesiastical polity. Because inferences of a very different, and opposite nature will follow, according as they may adopt one or other of these different systems. But instead of entering into a full examination of the subject, we are entertained with general declamation, or with particular circumstances that sometimes give no very favourable opinion of the hierarchy.

Such as when Dr. Stock offers it as a reason in support of the present established church, that the crown will hardly be induced “to part with  
“ *a considerable share of influence* in the House of  
“ Peers.”

Whether this language be very honourable to the right reverend bench, is easy to judge. It certainly holds them out in a very different point of view from the hereditary nobility; whose dignity

nity would be debased by such a representation. The importance of that noble order in our admired constitution, is to support the rights both of the crown, and of the people, by forming a barrier to withstand the encroachments of either.

It has often been objected against the bishops having seats in parliament, that their influence in the House of Lords was hurtful to the constitution. To this Dr. S. would reply by boldly proclaiming the fact, and would seem to place the security of the order upon the abuse of their privilege—acknowledging with apparent satisfaction that they act under the *influence* of the crown. *Note 15. at the End*  
 This is paying them a bad compliment; and *Note 5. page 17.*  
 would seem to represent them as unworthy of a seat in that august assembly, as being creatures of the crown, depending upon it, and therefore not supporting the dignity of lords of parliament. Is not this, indirectly, accusing them as unworthy of the honourable rank to which they are advanced—as betraying the high trust committed to them, as counsellors of the crown. Is *Note*  
 it not representing them as men, whose judgment was biassed and corrupt; and that though they ought to be directed by integrity, and an awful regard to truth, and justice, and the prosperity of the kingdom, yet that the interest of the empire, at large, was not their concern, being devoted to a *part* of it, and therefore not friends of the *entire* constitution. Is it not censuring them, as if they made the most unworthy return to his Majesty for the confidence he has placed in them, by raising them on account of their supposed integrity and wisdom, to sit with princes in the great council of the nation, to deliberate on the weighty affairs of government, and to assist him by faithful advice. *22.*

May



May it not, also, tend to create and to secure this *influence* of the crown, that so many of the clergy as are advanced to the bench of bishops, are men raised from an humble station to riches and eminence: so that their habits of thinking and acting must often be ill suited to support that dignity to which they are advanced, and shew how little qualified they are for a place amidst the PEERS of the realm. In this kingdom the matter may still be worse, where so many clergymen of another kingdom are raised to be bishops, who cannot be supposed to have any *natural* attachment to this country; but who, perhaps, are prejudiced against its interest, and are not only devoted to the crown, but use all their influence to promote an English interest, not upon the generous and liberal principles of an intimate and just union of interest and affection between the two kingdoms, which ought to be maintained, but by rendering this kingdom dependent upon, and merely subservient to the power and wealth of England.\*

Their apologist, however, is not ashamed of representing them as *influenced*, and grounding his defence of their political importance on their *supposed* corruption and desertion of duty. Did he not know the fatal effects such conduct has produced in the history of England, and with how much severity the conduct of bishops has been censured by men of the highest authority among episcopals? But, the authority even of Lord Falkland seems to weigh little with him: does he think his character is more justly delineated by Mrs. Macaulay, than by Clarendon, or Hume? and yet Laud appears to be no favourite. Did he, then, intend in this covert manner

to

\* See Primate Boulter's Letters.

to warn this enlightened age of the danger of ecclesiastical authority, and to bring the conduct of the bishops in the House of Peers, as an instance of " the ill use of power which, he says, " churchmen of all denominations have been " apt to make, when trusted with too much of " it ?"\*

Had this charge against the bench of bishops been brought by us, it, no doubt, would have given high offence. The Bishop of Cloyne might have thought it *vilifying*. But coming from his apologist, it meets his Lordship's full approbation, as he has adopted his arguments, and appealed to them in his defence.

Political men speak a very different language from our ecclesiastics. Such conduct they have deemed ruinous to the state. They have told us, that " the principle of monarchy is corrupted, " when the first dignities are marks of the first " servitude; when the great men are deprived of " public respect, and rendered the low tools of " arbitrary power."

*Note*  
46.B.

" Again, it is corrupted, when mean and abject souls grow vain of the pomp attending " their servitude, and imagine that the motive " which induces them to be entirely devoted to " their prince, exempts them from all duty to " their country."† In this condemnation the established hierarchy stands, in the judgment of an English parliament. And here the whole question might rest, concerning the episcopal clergy considered in a point of view merely *political*.

Along

\* Dr. Stock, p. 107.

† Montesquieu, *L'Esprit de Loix*, lib. viii. c. 7.



Along with the power of the state, Dr. Stock adduces the number of the episcopal church, in Ireland, as a reason for her continuance, alleging it is superior to that of the Presbyterian church. Such want of information would scarcely be excusable in a *stranger* who should undertake to write of the affairs of this kingdom: but it would seem unpardonable in a native. Instead of considering the actual state of the north of Ireland, and from thence making a computation of the respective numbers of the two churches, he refers us to the returns made by hearth-money collectors, more than half a century ago. These do not distinguish the relative numbers of Protestants of different denominations, but he has made such allowance to each as he thinks best, and in this way finds a great superiority on the side of his *church militant*.† Every one will see, in this mode of computation, we may make the relative number of either church what we please.

I had laid it down, he says, “ as an indisputable fact,” that the Presbyterians outnumber the Episcopalians.

So I thought; and at present, do not entertain the smallest doubt of it. My opinion of the numbers of our church, is taken from the number of our congregations, and the number of families, on an average, in each congregation. Some gentlemen, who have paid a good deal of attention to this matter, have assured me, that they amount to upwards of half a million. This calculation is confined to the north of Ireland, and to Presbyterians only.

I do

† Doctor Stock, p. 22.

I do not pretend to ascertain the numbers of the established church, either in the North, or throughout the kingdom; nor the proportion they bear to Presbyterians. But not to pass it by unnoticed, I would observe, that Dr. Stock makes the Protestants of every denomination amount to about 517,155, or 517,505, for there is an error in the figures, probably in the printing. Others, who seem to have used the same returns to government, give 2,000 Protestant families more than Dr. Stock. Now, if we deduct from the largest of these numbers, 500,000 for the Presbyterians of the North only, there will be scarcely any left for the established church, for Dr. S. allows 4,000 families to the Presbyterians in the rest of Ireland, which amount to 20,000, and makes the whole number of Presbyterians throughout the kingdom 520,000, a greater number than he has assigned to all the Protestants of every denomination. So that if he would support his calculation, he must go upon very different principles from those he has assumed.

It may be observed, though not strictly connected with the present question, that they who go upon Dr. Stock's principles, tell us, that the number of inhabitants of Ireland make, in all 2,015,229 souls. That the number of Popish families amounts to 281,423, which, counting five to a family, makes 1,407,115. Compared to which, Protestants at large are in proportion of one to somewhat more than two and a half. And Presbyterians, alone, are in proportion to Roman Catholics of one to three. We see how very different this is from the calculation of a writer, much praised by the Bishop of Cloyne, who says, the Protestants in Ireland, when com-



Note  
30 B.

pared with the Papists, are in the proportion of one to sixteen.\* And we see, also, what caution is necessary in stating facts of national importance, and how easily, even, learned men are led astray.

Note  
23.

Dr. Stock having assumed what balance he thought good, in favour of the numbers of the established church, half a century ago, thinks, "It is scarcely necessary to observe, how much more the scale must since that time have preponderated for the church by the continual influx of conformists of every kind into the pale, while very few indeed have acceded to the Dissenters."†

But this will require other sort of proof than bare assertion. For it has been observed, and has been lamented, that by pluralities and non-residence, and the consequent neglect of duty in the established clergy, many members in different parts of the kingdom, particularly in the South, have deserted the church. So that it is much questioned, whether the *comparative* numbers of the established church be much greater than formerly, or even so great. And the suspicion is very much increased by the representation the Bishop of Cloyne has given of, what he calls, the defects in the settlement of the church of Ireland,‡ but what others have called the most shameful neglect of duty.

It will readily be acknowledged, however, that converts are made to the church. And so have they been to every established church, whether  
Heathen,

\* Theophilus, p. 98. † Dr. Stock's Reply, p. 23.

‡ Bishop of Cloyne, sect. ivth.

Heathen, Mahometan, or Christian, Popish or Protestant. The good things she has to offer, have powerful attractions; and we see some of her highest dignities, now, enjoyed by men who have gone from among us.—And the observation is very ancient, and of high authority, that, *ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled.\** And so it happened in succeeding ages. The ecclesiastical historians, speaking of the reign of Constantine, tell us, that some were converted by examining the doctrine, others by the love of *honours*, and the necessity of imitating the *ruling powers*, and many from dissimulation.† That the bishops of Asia, contrary to their faith, condemned the council of Calcedon, to gratify the emperor Basiliscus.‡ Julian the apostate,\* as has been observed, had his test-act, and schools and colleges established in support of the heathen temples, and his ideas of making converts have been, also, very faithfully imitated by christian churches, both Popish and Protestant, who have found them equally useful. How far such modes of conversion are suited to the genius of the christian religion, is of a very different consideration, and ought, it would seem, to command our most serious attention. Coming from so unhallowed a source, it can be no very honourable expedient to support the dignity of a church that boasts of high perfection: and yet, as if it were essential to her safety, we see how zealously,

note  
24

K 2

at

\* John vi. 26.

† Οἱ δὲ, ζηλώσαντες τοὺς χριστιανὰς τῆς παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ τιμῆς, ἀναγκαῖον ὥσθησαν τὰ τὰ κρατύντος ἢ μιμησασθαι. Sozomen. Hist. Eccl. p. 450. Εἰρωνεύαντ' ἀλεκτον τῶν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν υποδύομενων, καὶ τοὺς χριστιανῶν ἐπιπλάσας σχηματίζομενων ὄνομα. Eusebius de vita Constantini. p. 553.

‡ Evagrius, p. 341. Sozomen, p. 674.

\* Πολλὰ δὲ καὶ κολακείας καὶ δωρεαῖς ἐπὶ τὸ θύειν προετρέπετο. — Ὅσοι μὴ ὀρθῇ γνώμῃ ἐχριστιανίζον, Ὅσοι τὰ χρήματα καὶ τὴν ἐνταῦθα τιμὴν, τῆς ἀληθείας



at this day, it is retained by the church of England. But, religion in the hands of political men ever assumes the same features. The first christian Emperor led the way in this manner of proselyting, by his imperial edict: and his example has been too well followed, and has deluged the christian world with torrents of blood, and has been productive of every calamity that could flow from the worst passions of the human heart. The dreadful contentions and divisions that were the effects of the emperor's interference in the disputes of different sects, we are told, also, prevented many from embracing christianity.\*

But, among the emperors of this period, we find some whose names should be mentioned with distinguished honour. Jovian declared that none should suffer any injury for his faith: but those that promoted peace and unity, should be esteemed by him and particularly honoured.† The younger Theodosius, also, would establish the law of kindness and good-will; and his favourite bishop, Proclus, of the like amiable temper, thought no one should be treated with unkindness for being of a different sect—that it was a small thing that others should maintain different sentiments of God—and that they were to be brought over, only, by a spirit of meekness.‡ And it may be observed, that Constantine was of the same mind, before, unhappily for the peace of the christian world, he convened and conversed with his bishops at the council of Nice.

\* “ The rage for proselytism is one of the curses of the world. I wish, saith an excellent writer, to make no proselytes, except to candour, and charity, and honest enquiry.” Dr. Price's Sermon. p. 158.

† Socrates, Eccles. Hist. p. 205.

‡ Ibid, p. 386.

Ευδαιμονίας προκριναντας, μη μελλησαντας προστο θυειν απεκλινον. Socrat. Eccles. Hist. p. 184. l. 3. c. 13.

Nice.\* These sentiments were maintained by King William, and the princes of the house of Hanover, but were too generous and liberal for the people whom they governed, for being trained up under an ambitious hierarchy, too many of them, even of the highest rank, contracted a littleness of mind which either could not discern, or could not endure the divine precepts of benevolence and christian unity.

One of the most admired writers on the constitution and manners of England, makes the following reflection on this subject, and if it may be applied with equal propriety to Ireland, it will not convey any idea favourable to the established church, of the cause of that “ continual influx of conformists into the pale,” which our author mentions with ostentation.

“ With regard to religion, as, in this state  
 “ every subject has a free will, and must conse-  
 “ quently either be conducted by the light of  
 “ his own mind, or by the caprice of fancy, it  
 “ necessarily follows that every one must either  
 “ look upon all religion with indifference, by  
 “ which means they are led to embrace the esta-  
 “ blished religion; or they must be zealous for  
 “ religion in general, by which means the num-  
 “ ber of sects is encreased.”†

The Bishop of Cloyne had entertained an opinion, that Presbyterians were very numerous and very powerful, when distrusting, as it would seem, the authority of government to support the laws, his Lordship appeals to their influence

—“ as

\* Eusebius, p. 469, 471. † L'Esprit de Loix, l. xix. c. 27.

Handwritten text at the bottom of the page, likely a library or archival stamp, is mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through. It appears to contain the words "LIBRARY" and "MUSEUM" in a circular arrangement, with some numbers and dates like "1814" and "1815" visible.



—“ as the conduct of so *numerous* and respectable a body may decide the event.”†

But, this we may suppose is only the language of fear; for here, again, in the opinion of Dr. Stock, the Bishop must be mistaken, both in regard to their numbers and the propriety of their interfering. We have just seen, he does not think them thus numerous; neither does he think they ought to interpose in support of the constitution, were it even in that imminent danger which the Bishop's fears, or his zeal represented. After the death of Charles I. every one knows, the constitution was in imminent danger, and the worthy Doctor thinks them deserving of censure for having then interposed in its support: and for that purpose, has adduced the censure of Milton, which he not only appears much delighted with, but wishes to heighten, and to dwell on with peculiar pleasure.

Now, either the Bishop of Cloyne must be wrong in calling on the Presbyterians of Ireland to interpose at present; or Dr. Stock must be wrong in censuring them for having interposed formerly. For though the answer of Milton is addressed to the presbytery of Belfast merely as an ecclesiastical body, yet it ought to be considered in a very different and more extensive view. It was the centre of union to the whole body of the Presbyterians—the principal members of their persuasion met with them, acted with them, and gave the sense of the whole body which they represented: and they acted in concert with the friends of monarchy in England and in Scotland.

In

† Bishop of Cloyne, p. 78.

In the distraction of the British empire at that time, there could be no regular, or constitutional meeting of the people of Ireland: and, if in convulsions of the state, it is the duty of every citizen to stand up in defence of his country, the Presbyterians of Ireland acted a most generous and praise-worthy part—shewed the most determined resolution—and in the face of a victorious army, and amidst distress and calamity, maintained an invincible steadiness in support of the constitution. A dignity of conduct the Cavaliers could not support; for we have an authority that Dr. Stock often appeals to, which speaks of Cavaliers taking the *engagement*, an oath that abjured the kingly government, and tended to establish a republic.\* The political principles of Presbyterians was the subject to be examined. The passage adduced from Milton, who wrote in defence of the republic, is a striking evidence, and is instead of a hundred other proofs of their attachment to the constitution, and fully confirms the historical account in our records.

Note

22

Note

25.

His observations on the duty of the clergy, and the rank they ought to hold in the state, are wise and judicious, but decidedly in opposition to the ecclesiastical polity of Dr. S. and the Bishop of Cloyne. For he inveighs against the clergy acting, “as if they were a tribe and party by themselves; which he says, is the next immediate way to make the church lift a horn against the state, and claim an absolute and undepend-  
 “ing jurisdiction, as from like advantages and  
 “occasion (to the trouble of all Christendom)  
 “the

\* Neal's History of the Puritans: which, from delicacy, I would not have mentioned, as he might be objected to as a party writer, had not Dr. Stock first adduced his authority.



“ the Pope hath many ages done ; and not only  
 “ our bishops were climbing after him, but our  
 “ presbyters also, as by late experiment we  
 “ find.”

Note  
 18.

So that all the weight of Milton's authority, and all the power of his argument, is in support of the principle, I have repeatedly laid down, that it is dangerous to trust power in the hands of ecclesiastics of any denomination——that the boasted ALLIANCE between church and state is an engine of tyranny, and therefore in a government founded in civil liberty, the clergy ought to form no separate political body, “ but, “ according to him, as members of the commonwealth, *they ought to mix with other commoners*, and in that temporal body to assume “ nothing above other private persons.” And in this manner, most undoubtedly, did the Presbyterian ministers act in that very instance, in which he condemns them for acting otherwise. For they mixed with other commoners, and acted as members of the state, and did not assume any thing above other private persons. They claimed no political power as an ecclesiastical body : they consulted with the people, and represented their sense of the state of the kingdom.

Now, it may be asked, to what purpose did Dr. Stock produce this testimony of Milton, so fully and directly against his argument ? Was it to shew that Presbyterians could not be trusted as cordial friends of the constitution ? But no historical evidence can more clearly prove the reverse. Was it, in this indirect manner, to censure the Bishop of Cloyne for his begging the interposition of Presbyterians at present ? Or, was it merely for the purpose of invective ? And by

by the assistance of such an auxiliary, deprive them of that praise, which it is the province of history to record, and which the generous mind is happy to bestow, as the reward of the worthy and the brave?

When government proceeds in a peaceful and regular order, and is not distracted by rebellion or civil war, I would condemn presbytery as well as convocation, for assuming any degree, or even an appearance of civil power. Such power belongs to neither of them. They should be "limited to church matters, and these," only, "are within the compass of their province." But if the General Synod of Ulster might, without censure, address his late Majesty in the time of rebellion, expressing their loyalty and attachment to his person and government, and their determined resolution to support the constitution, could it be imputed to their predecessors as a crime to offer their support to the fallen state, and to use all their most vigorous exertions, along with the friends of the constitution, to restore it—and which they actually did restore.\*

This attachment to our constitution had subjected Presbyterians to the censure of two very opposite

L

\* See appendix to a pamphlet, entitled, a Calm and Plain Answer to the Enquiry, Why are you a Dissenter from the Church of England? Where the author shews from the united suffrage of the historians of those times, that the *Presbyterians* had the principal hand, and were the chief agents, in restoring King Charles II. to the throne. As many may not have seen this pamphlet, I may just observe, that his authorities are as follow: Clarendon, vol. vi. p. 374, 475, 733. Echard's Hist. of Eng. p. 654, 708. Rapin's Hist. of Eng. vol. xiii. p. 199, 200, 227, 241, 242. Burnet's Hist. of his Times, vol. ii. p. 242. Hume's Hist. of Great Britain, vol. ii. p. 113, 158. Critic. Hist. of Eng. vol. ii. p. 307, 308, 350, 411. Maiz. Collec. p. 61.

*Echard's Hist. of Eng. Vol. III. p. 6*



posite parties, republicans and high-churchmen; who had each laboured to subvert it. The one to lay aside kingly government—the other to establish tyranny, of which they would gladly have been the ministers. For the view of the prelates was to exalt the hierarchy on the ruins of public liberty, and to acquire dominion and independence to their own order.\* The determined opposition of the Presbyterians, to both these parties, incurred their enmity; the effects of which were dreadful.

*Note*  
34

But, though in the times of public distraction, the contending parties might, in their turn, express the highest resentment against Presbyterians for opposing or overturning their schemes, yet what are we to think of churchmen, to-day, adducing the invective of a republican of the last century against *them* for their loyalty? In regard to intolerance, let him pursue that in the most animated and embittered strain, we shall readily go along with him, for of that we are very far, indeed, from being an advocate. But, says the learned Doctor, “the style of this writer (Milton) vehement at all times, appears to have been whetted to a peculiar degree of sharpness against a *little* presbytery interposing its manifesto amidst the shock of nations, and from a barbarous nook of Ireland presuming, faith he, to brand us with the extirpation of laws and liberties; things which they seem as little to understand, as aught that belongs to good letters or humanity.”†

What are we to think of our learned opponent? Is he who would set up his church as the support

\* Hume's Hist. Eng.

† Dr. Stock, p. 57.

support of monarchy, turned advocate for these republicans? And after they had put the king to death, who is commonly esteemed the holy martyr of the church, and subverted the constitution, does he deem it wrong to "brand them with the extirpation of the laws?" And was this, in his esteem, an evidence that these were "things which Presbyterians seemed as little to understand as aught that belongs to good letters or humanity"? How much soever we admire the exalted genius of this distinguished character, who was an honour to his country and to humanity, yet it is evident that Presbyterians disliked his politics. But perhaps, he might have entertained more favourable sentiments of them, had he lived to see this *little* presbytery and their adherents, by their wisdom and steadiness, assert the cause of their country at the Revolution, and by their matchless valour, "amidst the shock of nations," save this kingdom to the crown of England.\* Perhaps their conduct might have induced him to think more favourably of their understanding and their principles, and to soften all his studied invective, which Dr. Stock is, now, so fond of retailing.

But, however these things might have been, and how fond soever high-churchmen may be to detract from the distinguished services of our forefathers, we must notwithstanding still glory in the honour which their conduct reflects on themselves, and on their posterity. Moderate churchmen, whom alone of that community we esteem the virtuous and the wise, will cheerfully pay the tribute of praise due to worthy actions—but to

L 2

secure

\* See Sir J. Dalrymple's Memoirs.



secure the approbation of high-churchmen, I hope, we shall ever look upon as an impossibility (I speak in a political sense) because their approbation can only be obtained by a conduct unworthy and dishonourable.

Our author would controvert, or at least, would *wish* to controvert the account I have given of the first settlement of our ministers, and their enjoyment of the tithes.

“ I cannot find, that the Presbyterians ever  
 “ had, or could have, *as the laws of this kingdom*  
 “ *stood*, public encouragement to expect or en-  
 “ joy church benefices, without renouncing their  
 “ own church principles.”\*

This is acknowledged, and the contrary is nowhere asserted. How *the laws then stood*, is perfectly well known. But the question, here, is concerning historical fact. Did the Presbyterian ministers, or did they not, enjoy the church benefices, however the laws of this kingdom then stood. The fact is undoubted. History shews us that our ministers were inducted into the churches, with the approbation and concurrence of the bishops.

The manner is particularly related in those extracts from the *Historical Essay* † published by Dr. Stock in his appendix—the bishop being acknowledged a presbyter, and as such to have power of ordination

\* Dr. Stock, p. 81.

† The *Historical Essay* upon the loyalty of Presbyterians in Great Britain and Ireland from the Reformation to the year 1713, was written by James Kirkpatrick, D. D. one of the Ministers in Belfast; and published with the concurrence of the General Synod.

ordination in conjunction with other presbyters, proposed to join with them in ordaining: and that all those things which were scrupled at, in the established form, should be laid aside, and the exceptionable expressions exchanged for others, to be concerted with the consent and approbation of the minister to be ordained—this proposal being consented to, he was ordained publicly in the church, in the manner agreed upon, finding nothing in it repugnant to his principles: and hoping that this might happily contribute to the *union* of Protestants, and to the strengthening the plantation of Ulster. And we may suppose, as a matter of course, that the names of the ministers thus ordained and inducted, were entered into the bishop's roll.

This was not done by act of parliament, but, as I have said, by *encouragement of government*. Lord Chichester, then Lord Deputy of Ireland, being educated a Puritan, gave them great *encouragement*; finding it for the interest of the crown and kingdom. And they did "enjoy" the church benefices without renouncing "their own church principles," and continued to enjoy them, though they remained Presbyterian still, and used not the liturgy, till at length they were taken from them by Cromwell. At the Restoration, they were not restored to their benefices—those were intercepted by the episcopal clergy, who were not ashamed to continue the oppression of Cromwell against our fathers. The primacy was filled by a bigotted high-churchman, Bramhall—severe laws were passed—the usurpations of the episcopal clergy were confirmed, and they have continued to enjoy those livings which Presbyterian ministers had



had held from their first settlement in this kingdom, till they were ejected by Cromwell.

This is the account I have given, which I again repeat, and call upon Dr. Stock to controvert any of the facts. But, he appears to be sensible that the matter was as I have related it, for he expresses his wonder, how they *continued to enjoy* the church benefices under the jealous administration of Strafford.

By the *encouragement of government*, and supported by the *state*, I had said, our ministers were inducted into the churches, as we have seen—this my learned opponent changes, in his way, into *parliamentary* encouragement—calls on me to retract what I had *not* said—and then speaks of CANDOUR !

He opposes an historical account, not by denying the facts, because facts are stubborn things, but by speaking of certain laws then existing. If we examine Blackstone, we shall find a number of laws now existing, which are not obeyed, being gone into disuse. Shall we from the existence of such laws in the statute book, argue against the common practice of the nation in breach of them ?

But still he says, that “encouragement (to “ enter upon benefices) neither was, nor by the “ laws then existing, could be held out (to the “ Scots ministers) without renouncing their own “ church principles.”

The Calvinist doctrines were the principles of both churches—these principles they had no occasion to renounce. It was their form of church government,

government, and mode of public worship, I suppose, which were to be renounced. But we have seen that the great moderation of both churches then in Ireland, put them upon a fair and equal footing, so far as the difference of their discipline permitted, and thereby corrected, or if you will, dispensed with a partial law, which can only be supported by a narrow spirit of party.

Let us consider how the matter stands at present with the clergy of the established church, and whether any public, or *parliamentary* "encouragement is held out to them without renouncing their professed principles." The doctrinal articles of the xxxix contain a system of Calvinism, which, in many parts, is *generally* rejected by the clergy, and has been for a long period of time. But the law requires an assent and consent to all these, and declares that they were agreed upon for avoiding of *diversities* of opinions. Now, if the established clergy do, generally, disbelieve many of these opinions, how can they have public encouragement as the law stands, more than Presbyterian ministers had formerly, without renouncing their principles?

The Presbyterian ministers did openly acknowledge, and propose their difficulties, and the bishops by their condescension full of liberality, removed them: and thereby enabled them, in perfect consistency of principle, to be inducted into the churches.

The episcopal clergy are inducted now, without renouncing principles, which they hold in opposition to the law. How their difficulties are removed, so as to enable them to comply with  
all



all the requisites the law demands, I will not say, nor will I repeat the severe things that have been said by *some* of their own clergy, as well as by others, on this subject, lest it might appear invidious. The different modes of explaining, or apologizing for this conduct, are well known, but what is material to observe here, is, that they all proceed upon the principle of setting up private opinion in opposition to the laws now in being. If this be admissible in the case of the episcopal clergy, who *dissent* from the *doctrines* of the established church,\* it will not be easy to shew, that it was not, at least, equally admissible in the case of the Presbyterian clergy, who only dissented from the *forms* of it.

Shall we say, that the law of Elizabeth was *virtually* repealed, or which is the same thing, that, at the Restoration, Presbyterian ministers had a right to church benefices by *prescription*?† Would it not appear, that this was apprehended to be the case, otherwise where was the necessity of  
of

\* Our author, as if these things were unknown, speaks without hesitation of their “*unfeigned assent and consent*,” and as if their subscription was a test of uniformity of opinion among the established clergy—“to apprise men of each others sentiments.”—Page 90, 91. The importance of *uniformity* is illustrated in three instances, which our ingenious author has selected with great ability: these are the surplice—the organ—and the posture, in which a man must be fixed at his devotions. He does not say whether the effects of these be *political*. Besides, one of his instances would seem liable to objection, as contradicting the established doctrine, and therefore a breach of the act of uniformity: for one of the homilies teaches us, that “playing upon organs displeased God sore, and filthily defiled his holy house.” Hom. of the place and time of prayer, part ii. p. 131.

† Inter leges humanas existunt nonnunquam iniquæ, stultæque, & pestilentes; unde et abrogantur vel auctoritate superiorum, vel *consentiente neglectu populi*. Erasmus.

of enacting new laws at that time—if not for the particular purpose of depriving such Presbyterian ministers as survived that event, and who had formerly enjoyed the church livings, and were ejected by Cromwell. This appears to be our author's opinion, for he says, “ by the law of Charles II. the bishops lost the *power* (for they never had the *right*) of dispensing with the act of uniformity.” Where he acknowledges they used the *power*; and yet he objects against our history for saying they used it.

I must here again, request the reader not to place too implicit a confidence in the account our author has given of any passage he has quoted, or seems to quote from me : because he seldom gives my words, but chooses rather to give some explanation of them, which, I have reason to complain, is too often what he calls *misconstruction*, and the Bishop of Cloyne, *misrepresentation*, upon which he argues as may suit his purpose, which is sometimes very exceptionable. Thus speaking of the laws lately passed for the better payment of tythe ; he says,

“ Whether they shall be carried into effect, must depend very much upon the sentiments of our fellow citizens.” And among the objections to the operation of these laws, he observes, that “ the ministry of the dissenting communions may—undermine the property of the established clergy by infusing doubts of its public expediency : and even by insinuating, that to give the clergy the whole of what the law entitles them to receive, would be to ruin their morals entirely.”\*

M

This

\* Dr. Stock's Reply, p. 113.



This very liberal reflection is founded, it seems, on a passage in the VINDICATION, p. 46, in answer to a question of the Bishop of Cloyne, who asks, "What particular mischief could arise from the wealth of the clergy, circumstanced as ours, were their appointments as great, as some men *falsely imagine*?" Stating the passage as it stands, would have given no opportunity for invective: therefore, our author, with his usual ingenuity, either conceals, or gives a different representation of what is said: the Bishop spoke of "their appointment as great as some men *falsely imagine*:" this with our *candid* author, is, the *whole* of what the *law* entitles the "clergy to receive:" and upon this he has found out room for declamation. We need make no observation here.

The present publication is not enough for our author's talent in this way: he goes to a printed discourse, delivered some years ago before the general synod of Ulster, and where I was speaking of the sacred rights of private judgment and christian liberty, and of the purity of the christian faith and worship being injured by the interference of human authority—he represents it as referring to church emoluments, and then goes on with his usual declamation.\* In the opinion of the Bishop of Cloyne, the utility of the ecclesiastical establishment, besides teaching, is to form a *balance*, or something he calls a *cone*, to support the empire: but what seems to weigh much more with our author, is the maintenance of the clergy, or *feeding* them, as he handsomely expresses it; for with him, *feeding* would seem to be the great end of the ecclesiastical establishment.

Nor

\* Dr. Stock's Reply, p. 111.

Nor is he at all singular in this notion : many others have appeared equally fond of it. His Lordship may be included in the number, for it seems to enter deeply into his system of politics, as according to him, the payment of tythe involves in it the safety of religion and of the state. Ecclesiastics in ancient times became much enamoured of this doctrine. For at an early period, we are told, that the English clergy, not content with the “ donations of land made them  
 “ by the Saxon princes and nobles, and with the  
 “ temporary oblations from the devotion of the  
 “ people, had cast a wishful eye on a vast revenue, which they claimed as belonging to them  
 “ by a divine, indefeizable and inherent title—  
 “ forgetting what they themselves taught, that the  
 “ moral part only of the Jewish law was obligatory on christians, they insisted that the tenth  
 “ of all the produce of the land was a perpetual  
 “ property, conferred by Heaven on those who  
 “ officiated at the altar. During some centuries,  
 “ the whole scope of sermons and homilies was  
 “ directed to this purpose ; and one would have  
 “ imagined, from the general tenor of these discourses, that all the practical parts of christianity were comprehended in the exact and  
 “ faithful payment of tythes to the clergy.”\*

—At vos

Dicite, pontifices, in sancto quid facit aurum ?

“ I find no authority of history to persuade  
 “ me, that any two sects, differing from each  
 “ other as these do, will ever be brought to acquiesce in a mutual and fair enjoyment of the  
 “ church’s patrimony.”†

M 2

Here

\* Hume’s Hist. of England, vol. i. p. 61.

† Dr. Stock, p. 82.



Here it would seem to slip out again, inadvertently, that the *clergy* are the *church*, though he dare not avow it, nor tell us what he means by it. Every one knows the clergy are not entitled to all that political consequence that our opponents claim so strenuously for their church. The justness of this observation will readily be granted; where then shall we go in search of this church polity that always flies before us? Ecclesiastics will not be our guides in an enquiry, that might annihilate their claim, therefore it must be enveloped in obscurity, and *in words that darken counsel without knowledge.*

History, indeed, abounds with instances innumerable of the most unhallowed strife and contention of different sects, which have been fomented by those men, who by their profession, were under the most sacred obligation to teach and to practice peace and good will; but who, abusing their sacred profession, have had the address to make dupes of the world, and to engage mankind, under a veil of religion and the *interest of the church*, to enter with passion into all their schemes of ambition, or avarice.

This laid the foundation “of the church’s patrimony.” One of those weak and unworthy princes that are a dishonour to a throne, was the founder of a very material part of this patrimony in England. Ethelwolf, who is said to have been better qualified for governing a convent than a kingdom, when his dominions were ravaged by the hostile invasions of the Danes, took the pious resolution of going on a pilgrimage to Rome, where he distinguished himself by exercises of devotion, and liberality to the church. Being returned from his pilgrimage, “the ecclesiastics,

“ siastics, who had never been able to get possession of the tythes, seized the present favourable opportunity of making that acquisition ; when a weak, superstitious prince was on the throne, and when the people, discouraged by their losses from the Danes, and terrified with the fear of future invasions, were susceptible of any impression, which bore the appearance of religion.”\* This was after the middle of the ninth century.

The Bishop of Cloyne, no doubt, would give the most honourable place to this pious king, amidst “ the multitude of *sage legislators*, (names which adorn the history of the most enlightened nations upon earth !) who have for so many ages given their deliberate sanction to the ancient system of tythes.”†

And yet, notwithstanding this solemn pomp of words, whoever reads Father Paul on Benefices, or Selden’s History of Tythes, will probably form a very different opinion of those *sage legislators*, and will find that tythes were first established, not by the most *enlightened nations upon earth*, but at that period which history has distinguished as the *darkest ages* of the world, however afterwards they may have had the sanction of legislators.

But I cannot help being surpris’d that his Lordship would refer us to the *ancient* system of tythes, which is so exceedingly different from the *modern* system, which he would support, that one would think, he ought to have kept it cautiously

\* Hume’s Hist. of England. Rapin’s Hist. of England.

† Bishop of Cloyne, p. 7.



*Rapin*  
*Vol. 1.*

cautiously out of view. We have seen, that by the ancient system, tythes were granted for several purposes,\* and that the clergy were, only, appointed trustees of what was a joint property. So the oblations of the faithful had been managed in England, in the days of Austin the monk, by order of Pope Gregory. And hospitality to the poor and to the stranger was continued, at least by the monks, till the Reformation. But in process of time the clergy found means of securing to themselves the whole of that charitable fund. So that this part of the patrimony of the clergy, for they, it seems, are the *church*, was founded in weakness and superstition, and was made the sole property of the clergy by injustice.

How this patrimony was founded in Ireland, we know not. The Bishop of Cloyne and some of his apologists, have laid it down in a peremptory manner, that it is not only the property of the clergy, but the most ancient property in the kingdom. But being called upon for their authority; they are still silent. And their account is the more liable to suspicion, because the only authority his Lordship has cited, seems to be clearly against him. The law of Henry III. which he finds in Selden,† ordains the tythe of certain fisheries to be paid, not to the clergy, but expressly to the *churches*. And though these words, at present, are confounded to serve the purposes

\* Vindication p. 46.

† Non expectato mandato Regis, vel assensu de gurgitibus & piscariis, ECCLESIIIS in quarum parochiis sunt prædicti gurgites vel piscariæ, decimas solvant, quia Rex non vult, in periculum animæ suæ, *hujusmodi* decimas detineant. Selden on Tithes, c. 7. It is not said how these tythes were to be used: whether for the purpose of hospitality, or to be sold for repairing the *churches*; or whether any part and how much was the property of the clergy.

purposes of the hierarchy, yet at that time, they had a distinct and separate meaning. How is it that those watchful guardians of the *church's* patrimony censure with so much severity, the conduct of our House of Commons in the case of agistment, and yet forget what was appropriated to the *churches*, that is, the houses for public worship, and the claims of the poor and of the stranger? Why do they not plead, as earnestly, for *restitution* in the cause of justice and of charity, as in the cause of the clergy?

This is spoken on the supposition that the clergy of Ireland were once in possession of the tythe of herbage, which is denied by learned men who have enquired into this subject, as well as by our House of Commons in 1736.

This question at that time, engaged the public attention. Pamphlets were published: one, in opposition to the claims of the clergy, entitled *Prescription Sacred*. Another in answer, entitled, *Property Inviolable*. And we have seen it lately gone into by Mr. Trant in his *Considerations on the Disturbances in Munster: Appendix iii.* But here it may be observed, that it would have been material to his argument, could that learned gentleman, have shewn that tythe-agistment had ever, in ancient or modern times, been in possession of the Irish clergy, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic. But this he has not attempted to shew. And yet it would seem altogether necessary to justify the freedom of his reflections on the conduct of our House of Commons: because if it cannot be shewn, it would appear evident that the vote of the Commons was dictated by truth, as well as a sacred regard to justice, which declares “that the demand of  
“ tythe-



“ tythe-agiftment is *new*, grievous, and burden-  
 “ some to the landlords and tenants of this  
 “ kingdom.”

As to our author's opinion, that different sects will never “ be brought to acquiesce in a mutual  
 “ and fair enjoyment of the church's patri-  
 “ mony,” it will readily be granted, that when the clergy of the reigning sect are ambitious of a high degree of *political* power, and are incessant in their demands of greater riches, although they already enjoy opulence in such profusion as is unknown in any Protestant state of Europe, it cannot be supposed that they should ever consent to any partition of their emoluments with any other sect, or to any diminution of them on any other account. But if this should be found necessary for the interest of religion and the state, it will not depend on the opinion of the clergy. This is properly the affair of the legislature. They may interpose now, as well as formerly. They may bring matters back to their first institution. They may divide the church's patrimony among such sects as they please. Or, they may make it the patrimony of the state,\*  
 and

Note  
 26.

\* “ The present empress of Russia has annexed the  
 “ church-lands to the crown; and in return grants annual  
 “ pensions to the hierarchy, the dignified clergy, and the  
 “ monks. The archbishops and bishops receive about  
 “ 1,000*l.* or 1,200*l.* per annum; and the subordinate eccle-  
 “ siastics in proportion.” Coxe's Travels into Russia, vol.  
 ii. p. 325. The archbishop of Upsala, primate of Sweden,  
 has 400*l.* a year.

Note  
 27.

Bishop Hooper, one of the first English reformers, says,  
 “ If the fourth part of the bishoprick remained unto the  
 “ bishop it were sufficient; the third part to such as should  
 “ teach good learning; the second part to the poor of the  
 “ diocese: and the other to maintain men of war for the  
 “ safeguard of the commonwealth: it were better bestowed  
 “ a great deal.” Upon the Commandm. p. 74.

and pay the clergy, as in several nations of Europe at present, and antiently under the Roman Emperors, out of the public treasury. And whenever our legislature, in their wisdom, shall make the clergy know their own place, and do their duty merely as ministers of religion, laying aside those dangerous claims of political power, they will then find it also the dictate of wisdom to make some alteration in the church's patrimony. And as we are told the clergy are "a peaceable and *helpless* class of men,"\* no danger is to be apprehended; and that state would be feeble, indeed, that should apprehend any danger from such useful and equitable change, notwithstanding all the high claims of political consequence that these *helpless* men would arrogate to themselves.

But our author says, he can find no authority of history to persuade him that different sects will ever be brought to acquiesce in a mutual and *fair* enjoyment of the church's patrimony.

Should this really be the case, and should history furnish us with the fullest evidence of this *unfairness* and partiality of every reigning sect, shall we therefore conclude that this ought ever to continue, and though the practice should be found unfair, or oppressive, or hurtful to the peace and happiness of any nation, that no reformation must take place? Had such maxims been pursued in other things, what state would the nations of the earth have been in to-day? All improvement would have been at an end. But in pursuing a different conduct, mankind have gone forward to higher degrees of perfection—

N

and

\* Bishop of Cloyne p. 93.



and is the church the only department that shall not be reformed and improved ?

Note  
at the End  
page 8.

However, in revolving the histories of the several kingdoms of Europe, we might possibly find some such arrangement as our author has sought for in vain. In the history of Poland we are told, that as the Protestants encreased, “ Sigismond Augustus not only indulged them  
“ in the most liberal exercise of their worship ;  
“ but admitted them, together with the Greeks,  
“ and all other sects then subsisting in Poland,  
“ to a seat in the diet, and to all the *honours and*  
“ *privileges* before exclusively confined to the Catholics. These maxims of unlimited toleration were so generally adopted by the nation  
“ at large, that the members of the diet, which  
“ assembled upon the decease of Sigismond Augustus, being of different persuasions, determined on a reciprocal indulgence of their respective tenets. In order to avoid any hateful  
“ distinctions, they called themselves indiscriminately “ DISSIDENTS in religion.” A phrase  
“ intimating, not, according to our notions, separatists from an established church, but simply persons holding a diversity of opinions in  
“ religious matters. It was at the same time  
“ enacted, that this difference of *religious* sentiments should create no difference in *civil* rights.  
“ And accordingly in the *pacta conventa* formed  
“ by the diet, the following clause was inserted,  
“ as part of the coronation oath to be tendered  
“ to the new sovereign,—I will keep peace  
“ among the Dissidents.—This clause Henry of  
“ Anjou swore to observe, before he was permitted to ascend the throne.

“ In

“ In process of time, however, the Roman  
 “ Catholics, having, under the protection and  
 “ influence of successive sovereigns, acquired a  
 “ considerable ascendancy, ventured to appro-  
 “ priate the expression of DISSIDENTS to all those  
 “ who dissented from the Catholic religion. The  
 “ term *dissidents* began to grow of a less inoffen-  
 “ sive import, and to convey an idea of non-  
 “ conformity. The privileges of these churches  
 “ were gradually diminished—the members were  
 “ subjected to a variety of disqualifications, and  
 “ at length, in 1733, formally incapacitated from  
 “ sitting in the diet.

“ Such was the situation of the Dissidents at  
 “ the accession of his present Majesty; who,  
 “ though himself strongly inclined to toleration,  
 “ was yet obliged to concur with the general  
 “ sense of the diet. The Dissidents applied to  
 “ the courts of London, Petersburg, Berlin,  
 “ and Copenhagen, as the mediating powers in  
 “ the treaty of Oliva; who warmly supported  
 “ their cause, and presented memorials to the  
 “ ensuing diet, demanding a restoration not only  
 “ of their religious establishments, but also of all  
 “ their ancient privileges secured to them by the  
 “ above-mentioned treaty. The diet of 1766,  
 “ however, was not of a temper to accede to  
 “ these proposals.”\*

Here it is to be observed, that while these dif-  
 ferent churches were united in the equal enjoy-  
 ment of the honours and privileges of the king-  
 dom, and in a liberal exercise of their worship,  
 the nation flourished, was happy at home and re-  
 spected abroad. But, when one of these churches

N 2

did

\* Coxæ's Travels into Poland, Russia, &c. vol. i. p. 24.



did unjustly, as well as most unwisely, establish itself on the ruins of the others, and deprive them of the common privileges of citizens, their country became a scene of distraction and misery, was stained with blood, and their fairest provinces torn away, and dismembered from the state, by the neighbouring powers, who availed themselves of these religious persecutions, as we have seen in our day.

In reviewing the history of other countries, we can more easily divest ourselves of prejudice, and where our interest does not interfere to warp our judgment, we can readily discern the fatal effects of a partial and unfair ecclesiastical establishment; and can as readily see the happy effects of a church polity that disdains these narrow, contracted maxims, and is founded on principles that are equal, manly, and generous.

And in regard to our own country, when more *equal* laws, and in the opinion of many, more *just* and *useful* laws shall take place in regard to the church's patrimony, it will then be obvious to common sense, that it is for the interest of the state and of religion, that all sects that are equally attached to the constitution, should equally receive the protection and support of the legislature—"if the *largest* will naturally demand it, the *best* will surely deserve it. And "should not merit weigh more than numbers," taken throughout the extent of the empire, as Dr. Stock would have it. He has, with uncommon acrimony, railed at the Dissenters in New England for persecution, without considering that, at the same time, his own church was much more deeply involved in the guilt of this worst of all crimes. It would have been more useful to  
have

have held out to his own party, how much more the descendants of these men are, at present, advanced in liberality of thinking and acting, than his own church.

A parallel between the parties was thus stated a few years ago.

In New England, where the legislative bodies were almost to a man Dissenters from the church of England :

1. There is no test to prevent churchmen holding offices.

2. The sons of churchmen have the full benefit of the Universities.

3. The taxes for support of public worship, when paid by churchmen, are given to the episcopal minister.

In Old England :

1. Dissenters are excluded from all offices of profit and honour.

2. The benefits of education in the universities are appropriated to the sons of churchmen.

3. The clergy of the Dissenters receive none of the tythes paid by their people, who must be at the additional charge of maintaining their own separate worship.\*

The Bishop of Cloyne blames the American States for separating civil polity from religion, and calls it a novel hasty speculation ; and yet, perhaps, allowing the episcopal clergy to receive tythe from their own people under their new government, as was done formerly, might meet with the indulgence of his Lordship, and of his apologist, how averse soever they might be

\* Appendix to two letters addressed to the Right Rev. Prelates, who a second time rejected the Dissenters bill, 1772.



be from imitating it : for different measures of conduct become them, from any other church. Dr. Stock highly approves of repealing the test-act in Scotland which prevented episcopals from holding offices ; but would continue it in England : and takes occasion to abuse Oldmixon for calling in question the justice of the British parliament in this unequal dealing\*. With the like *liberal* temper, the convocation of Ireland, in their address to Queen Anne, in 1711, were not ashamed to call the *Presbyterian Directory* seditious and fanatical, though it was the directory of the church of Scotland, equally established under her Majesty's government, as the service-book of the church of England or Ireland.

Our author now takes us into new ground. He engages in a subject that has not any connexion with the question in debate. He has spent the greater part of his book in describing and railing at the severity of discipline, the want of moderation, and the unpolished manners of the early age of the church of Scotland.

Let all this be granted to him : and what then ? How does this affect the argument with the Bishop of Cloyne ? Does it shew that prelacy is *essential* to our civil constitution ? Does it shew that because of the austerity and faction that prevailed in Scotland two hundred years ago, that the Presbyterians of Ireland, to-day, are not entitled to national confidence ? Or, does it shew, that because of the ungainly appearance of presbytery in Scotland at the beginning of the Reformation, or a century after, there cannot be any *other* form of the Presbyterian church ? Does it prove that the form and discipline of  
Geneva

\* Dr. Stock, p. 46

Geneva is the same? Does he not know, it is not? Or, of Holland, or Switzerland, or Prussia; or that the model presented by the assembly of divines at Westminster to the English parliament was the same as the book of discipline presented by Knox in 1560? Or what is more immediately to our purpose, that the discipline of the Presbyterian church of Ireland at present, is the same? This he has not attempted to prove; and if he cannot prove it, all his objections fall to the ground.

It might, therefore, be enough to observe in answer to all his tedious remarks on this subject, that if our government should at any time engage in a farther reformation of the established church, which stands in so much need of reformation; and if in their wisdom they should adopt the Presbyterian model, as the English parliament did in the last century, we would suppose in this very enlightened age, that they would choose the best and purest model of the Presbyterian church, as it is to be found in the first and purest ages of christianity.

He must have known that the discipline of the church of Scotland, which he so much dislikes, is not at all peculiar to presbytery, nor *necessarily* connected with it. For he himself has observed, that Geneva was different: and if he examines the history of this latter church, he might find that its discipline was altered, and improved in this century: and he might have observed other Presbyterian churches different from both. And he might have found that episcopals of high fame, and much revered by his own church, held, as we shall see, similar notions of discipline.

But,



But, be this as it may, to what purpose in the present argument, is his long and tedious invective against the church of Scotland; filled with so much acrimony? Professing liberality of sentiment, he should have considered, whether this was irritating or conciliatory—tending to add, in an indirect manner, to the calumnies against the Presbyterians of Ireland, already so much complained of, and that have so justly given offence. Whether it was dictated by political wisdom, or by generosity of mind, or any remote view of serving the general interest of this kingdom—or, whether it was not imitating his patron, in attempting to sacrifice a general interest to the ungenerous, selfish views of party spirit.

In the various, uncertain matter, he has accumulated, I will not follow the learned Doctor, as it is commonly wide of the question agitated; yet it may possibly be of use to consider some of the most material things he has advanced, as it may give room for useful observation, for rectifying a variety of mistakes, and rescuing a neighbouring kingdom from the most unaccountable misrepresentation: and also, for farther illustrations on the nature of ecclesiastical establishments, and their malignant influence on religion and on the happiness of human society—which will ever be found to bear proportion to the power vested in the hands of the clergy.

We are told: “another pretence for expecting  
“the final ascendancy of Presbyterianism in  
“these kingdoms may deserve more attention—  
“its model is better suited perhaps to the temper of our people, and to the genius of our  
“civil constitution.”\*

To

To have argued with clearness, it was necessary to explain Presbyterianism, and what is meant by the final *ascendency* of it. The best and purest model of the Presbyterian constitution, I suppose, is to be found in the first age of christianity, according to the New Testament, and the practice of the christian church immediately after the days of the apostles. This is often called PRIMITIVE EPISCOPACY. Bishops and presbyters were at first of one order. No bishop's authority extended beyond his parish, the cure of which he served as parish minister. Hence we find many bishops settled in one city, as none had the care of more than one congregation.\* There was no pre-eminence of order among them, but a perfect parity of rank was maintained. A bishop was not overseer, or superintendent of the *inferior* clergy, as they are now called, but of the *people* committed to his pastoral care;† by whom, also, he was chosen. So that every christian bishop was no more than minister of a congregation, or as it is sometimes translated in the New Testament, *overseer* of the flock committed

\* Acts of Ap. xx. 17.

† Eusebius calls bishops, presidents of the laity, or of parishes. Bishop, or president, or rector of a parish, are names used indifferently by him speaking of the early church. Dionisius the Areopagite, first had the bishoprick, or oversight of the *parish* of Athens, *πρῶτος τῆς αθηναίων παροικίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐγκρατεῖς*. Eccl. Hist. p. 144. Pinitus was bishop of the *parish* of the Gnosseans: the brethren he had under his care were the laity, *τον ὑπ' αὐτῷ λαόν*. Ibid. Irenæus bishop of Lions, *τῆς παροικίας τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν διαδέχεται*, received the bishopric of the *parish*, p. 170. Alexander, being bishop of another parish, is called to be colleague of Narcissus in Jerusalem, p. 212. Two bishops of one parish becoming frequent, was forbidden in the council of Serdica. Valesii Annotat. in Eusebii Hist. Eccl. p. 160. James, the brother of our Lord, was the first



mitted to his care.\* A presbyter and a bishop were then but two names for the same office. The discipline they exercised was directed by the rules laid down in Scripture, and in applying these rules to particular cases, they, with the advice of their presbytery, and of the people, took care that all things should be done for edification. This is what I would call PRESBYTERIANISM, or primitive episcopacy.

The primitive churches were all equal; as were their ministers. Their standard of christian doctrine was the Scripture. They had not, as yet, invented creeds and confessions. This beautiful simplicity did not continue long. It was destroyed by bishops meeting in councils. Of this we have no instance during the first century. That which is commonly referred to at Jerusalem, in the Acts of the Apostles, was only the consulting of one church for advice.† But in the second century, when meeting in councils was introduced, this diminished the authority of the people, abolished the equality of bishops, and at length introduced metropolitans and patriarchs. Thus bishops who at first were only deputies

bishop of that parish of Jerusalem, *της παροικίας ταύτης*. Cyril in Catech. 14. Eusebius calls Seleucus, a soldier, bishop of the orphans and widows, of the poor and infirm. Eccl. Hist. p. 340. Pamphilus, the celebrated friend of Eusebius, suffered martyrdom with eleven others. This illustrious company is compared to a church. Pamphilus was a presbyter; Valens a deacon, the rest were catechumens and initiated. So that none were wanting of those *orders*, that are found among men. Ex Simeone Metaphraste, in Valefii Annot. in Eusebii Hist. Ec. p. 179. This was in the 4th century, and we may observe that a presbyter is accounted equal to a bishop, otherwise *one order* would have been wanting.

\* Acts, xx. 28.

† Chap. xv.

puties of their congregations, at last asserted a power from Christ to make laws in his church.\*

Bancroft about the year 1588, is said to be the first who maintained that the bishops in the church of England were a distinct order from priests, and had a superiority *jure divino*. It had been always held that the superiority of the order of bishops above presbyters was a politic human constitution, introduced with the temporal greatness of the christian church; but Bancroft, by his archbishop's directions, first advanced it to a *divine right*. This appeared a new and strange doctrine at that time, and gave great offence. For Cranmer and our first English reformers had laid it down that the Scripture maketh express mention of two orders only, priest and deacon.†

But, what is more particularly to our purpose, these primitive bishops dealt not in matters of civil government. The apostolical canons, as  
 O 2 they

\* This gradual change is pointed out in Mosheim's Hist. vol. I.

Constantine writes, that all honours in the church are equal. Epist. ad Antiochens. apud Euseb. p. 517. And the precedence that was given, Eusebius says, was for different causes, as seniority, &c. Eccl. Hist. p. 191. & Valesii Annotat. in Loc. A small acquaintance with antiquity shews, that *ἐπισκοπος*, *πρεσβυτερος*, *διακονος*, *διοικησις*, *παροικια*, *ἐκκλησια*, &c. were words in common use, not appropriated to *religion*, but to *civil* life. Hector is called *ἐπισκοπος*, bishop, by Homer. In the Athenian commonwealth there was an officer, named *ἐπισκοπος*, and Constantine called himself, bishop. Diocesis sometimes signifies a province containing, perhaps, a hundred bishops: sometimes, the office of Teller of the Exchequer. Eusebius. p. 3014. Theodor. Hist. Eccl: l. v. c. 9. Evagrii Hist. Eccl. l. ii. c. 8, 9, 18.

† Erudition of a Christian Man, published by authority of parliament, in 1543 with a preface by the King. Neal's Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 389.



they are called, say, that " a bishop should not  
 " meddle with the administration of public  
 " affairs, but attend upon ecclesiastical business :  
 " let him therefore be persuaded to forbear such  
 " meddling ; or let him be deposed."\*

note  
 30.

Their measures of submission to the civil magistrate, were not diminished, but strengthened by their religion, which was so far from countenancing the arrogant claims of power, either of episcopals, or any others, in the last or preceding century, or the fond dreams of prelacy at present, that it enjoined obedience to government as a principle of conscience, and taught it as a sacred duty to be good *citizens*, as well as good men. The consequence is, that the nearer any church approaches to this original institution,† it must have the greater degree of excellence, and therefore, if any distinction is to be made between subjects equally attached to the constitution, (which however I think ought not to be,) the members of such a church are entitled to the preference. And on this ground beyond all doubt, the Presbyterian church may claim this preference ; and in our own country more particularly, where it has been more friendly to the civil rights and liberties of mankind than the episcopal. What reason there may be " for expecting the final ascendancy, or general prevalence of this purest institution of christianity, so opposite to our established hierarchy, is of another consideration. But, if  
 ever

\* Can. 81.

† They that would wish to see this subject fully examined, on both sides, may be referred to *Altare Damascenum*. Bishop Hall and Bishop Taylor on the divine right of Episcopacy. Dr. Wells, and Mr. Pierce's Letters, in answer to him. White's Letters and the Dissenting gentleman's answer. Dr. Chauncey's compleat View of Episcopacy, &c.

ever it shall take place, it must contribute to the happiness of mankind by promoting the interest of religion and of our country.

The inquiry into the ecclesiastical establishment of Scotland ought to have been confined, it would seem, to a "point of view merely political." But as its influence tended to support civil liberty,\* this our author has prudently avoided, though it was alone of importance in the present argument; and he has chosen rather to consider its church *discipline*.

The first part he mentions is excommunication and its severe penalties: which, however, was not to be inflicted till the parties were heard before a court, and being convicted, refused upon admonition to confess their fault before the congregation: and he tells us, this was not to be pronounced on *light* occasions.

A prelate, in treating of a reformation of discipline in the church of England, and urging it in the most earnest manner, has recommended, that the rural deans, with at least three of the clergy of the deanery, should examine into the manners both of clergy and laity: and after the methods of private admonition had been tried, according to our Saviour's rule, but without effect, that the matter should be laid before the bishop; who, after his admonitions were also ineffectual, might proceed to censures, to a suspension from the sacrament, and to a full excommunication, as the case should require.

This improved scheme of discipline, Dr. Stock may observe, bears a very striking resemblance to  
the

\* Robertson's History of Scotland, *passim*.



the discipline of Knox, which he would reject and censure with so much severity. I know not whether the subject of church discipline has been examined by the learned Doctor with particular attention. If it had, I could scarcely think he would have been so forward in condemning a system which approaches so very near to what a *bishop* wished to see introduced into his church, and especially if it be true, as this prelate adds, that

“ This would bring our church, indeed, into a  
 “ *primitive* form, in which at present the clergy have  
 “ less authority, and are under more contempt,  
 “ than in any church that I have yet seen. The  
 “ want of a true well-regulated discipline is a  
 “ great defect, owned to be so in the preface to  
 “ the office of commination: and while we con-  
 “ tinue in this condition, we are certainly in an  
 “ *imperfect* state. We are in a *woful* condition,  
 “ in which the clergy are, as it were, shut out  
 “ from any share of the main parts of the care  
 “ of souls.”\* The Bishop of Cloyne, however, compliments himself, as we have seen, as being a guardian of the church: and the defects he has pointed out in the ecclesiastical establishment are of a very different nature; he only could find out a want of *more* money and *more* land.

Without entering into the merits of a question so foreign from our subject, I will only observe, that whoever compares this with the discipline exercised by many of the bishops of the fourth and fifth centuries, will be apt to think it a considerable mitigation of its severity. But, however terrible the effects were in our author's apprehension, yet are they light as air in comparison

\* Burnet's Hist. of his Times, vol ii, p. 380.

son of a certain excommunication, *happily* invented by high-churchmen, which consigns delinquents to eternal punishment. This they call excommunication *ipso facto*. It has this great advantage over the Scottish discipline, that there is no need of any admonition, as where the judge is to give sentence, but every one is to take notice of the law at his peril, and to see that he is not overtaken by it. And, no doubt, the utmost care is necessary, if this super-eminent power be lodged in the church, for it denounces a man, separated from Christ, and his church's communion, and devoted to the devil!

The causes of incurring this *terrible* censure are so contrived, it would seem, as to entrap almost every man of reflection, who should *unfortunately*, shall we say, be acquainted with this church, and her high claims of infallibility. For whoever shall say, any thing is wrong either in the common prayer, the thirty-nine articles, or government of the church; and whoever shall consult upon any course to be taken, which may tend to the impeaching or depraving of the doctrine of the church of England, or of the book of common prayer, or any part of the government or discipline now established therein, is *ipso facto* excommunicated.

We have it from high authority, that Calvinism is the orthodox doctrine of this church,\* and it is said, the clergy, in general, have rejected much of this doctrine, and have become Arminian. This great change was introduced chiefly by Laud, and brought about a revolution singular  
and

\* Not to mention the xxxix Art. or the Articles of Lambeth in 1595, we may refer to a declaration by the English Commons in 1628. Mrs. Macaulay, vol ii. p. 46, 56.



and extraordinary: for thereby the body of this clergy do, generally, stand excommunicated from their own church. Many others of their learned members, and no doubt, many unlearned, do stand in the same condemnation, doomed by their canons to future punishment.

I mention not this very extraordinary doctrine of *excommunication*, merely, to contrast it with that of Knox, or to go into any theological question, which in this debate is excluded by the Bishop of Cloyne, but for its *political* nature. For it will be asked, is this excommunication part of the ecclesiastical constitution, and as such *essential* to the state? If so, where shall we find this church? Or what is it?—Excommunicated persons cannot be members of it. And all, or almost all her reputed members stand excommunicated; and of course are not to be trusted as *cordial* friends to the entire constitution.

Never was a state reduced to so deplorable a situation—scarcely a *cordial* friend to be found to her *entire* constitution. The community consists of the established church and Dissenters, and these are almost all cut off from national confidence. Such are the admirable politics of high-churchmen, with which the nation is amused!

Some of her prelates, however, have treated this subject with a sort of contempt: for Bishop Hoadly says, “whoever thinks seriously, either  
“ of the manner, cause, or objects of our ex-  
“ communications, generally speaking, should,  
“ methinks, in pity forbear to mention the  
“ word.”\*

But,

\* Answer to the Committee, where this notion is examined.

But, should the judgment of the church, be thought decisive in this matter, in opposition to the opinion of this prelate, then as Usher's Calvinism seems to be disapproved by Dr. Stock, he should consider how far he himself is in danger of coming under this canonical censure. This is a very serious business, and not to be treated with levity, as the discipline of the church of Scotland, it seems, may be.

After a very partial account of the opposition given to the ill-fated expedition of Duke Hamilton into England,\* where he lost his life, we are told,

“ Of such minor prey as the Countess of  
 “ Argyle in the court of Mary Queen of Scots,  
 “ they made no account at all; having brought  
 “ her to the stool of repentance in a trice, for  
 “ being present at the baptism of our James I.  
 “ because performed according to the rites of  
 “ the church of Rome.”†

As this was looked upon by the Scotch reformers as joining in idolatrous worship, the question is, whether that was a proper object of church discipline? Early christians thought it so. Even those, who had not fortitude to endure the violence of persecution, and through fear of  
 P death

\* They that would see the reasons for opposing that rash and fatal expedition, may consult the Acts of the General Assembly.—Burnet's Memoirs of the House of Hamilton, p. 349.—Historical Essay on the Loyalty of Presbyterians, p. 227.—When the Doctor speaks of excommunicating a whole army, he seems to forget what he had written but a few pages before, that delinquents must be called before the consistory, tried in due form, and if convicted, to be at length excommunicated upon their continuing obstinate.

† Dr. Stock.



death had joined in idolatrous worship, were not exempted from the severe discipline of those early times. The Novatians would not permit them, ever again, to be received into the communion of the church. And notwithstanding this extreme severity, their institution is praised by the ancient historians, as productive of greater purity of manners.\*

The conduct of such members of the church of England, as were then at Queen Mary's court, may possibly have greater weight with our opponents: we are told, then, that "neither Bedford, the English ambassador, who was attended by a numerous and splendid train, nor any of the Scottish nobles who professed the Protestant religion, entered within the gates of the chapel. The spirit of that age, firm and uncomplying, would not, upon any inducement, condescend to witness an action, which it esteemed idolatrous."†

Knox, the Scottish reformer, so much revered in his country, seems to bear a striking resemblance to the character of Luther. Zeal, intrepidity, disinterestedness, were virtues which they both possessed in an eminent degree. Their maxims were often too severe, and the impetuosity of their tempers excessive. Their minds forcible and vehement in all their operations, roused by great objects, or agitated by violent passions, broke out on many occasions, with an impetuosity which astonishes men of feeble spirits, or such as are placed in a more tranquil situation. By carrying some praise-worthy dispositions

\* Eusebii, Hist. Eccl. p. 242. Socrat. Hist. Ec. p. 245.

† Robertson's History of Scotland, vol. i. p. 207.

positions to excess, they bordered sometimes on what was culpable, and were often betrayed into actions which exposed them to censure. Those very qualities, however, which now render their characters less amiable, fitted them to be the instruments of Providence for advancing the reformation among a fierce people, and enabled them to face dangers and to surmount opposition, from which persons of a more gentle spirit would have been apt<sup>\*</sup> shrink back.\*

But Dr. Stock can discern none of these virtues in the Scottish reformer, "whom," he says, "it is an act of patience to name without some note of dislike."†

Austerity of manners marked the age in which he lived; and a savage cruelty was too common, with which, however, he is not chargeable, and with which if his roughness of manners be compared, it is almost a virtue. What shall we say of Philip II. of Spain, and his executioner the Duke of Alba? Or, of Charles IX. of France, and the massacre of Paris? But these were of another church, and another country.—But, England, also, was stained with persecution. When, therefore, in considering the character of that age, the mind wishes to shrink back from such scenes of cruelty, it cannot easily join in that severity of censure against Knox, merely, for making the beautiful Queen of Scots shed tears; which is the instance our author mentions. We may discern the defects of his character, but we may, and ought to do justice to his virtues.

P 2

What

\* Robertson's Hist. of Scotland, vol. 1. p. 295. Hist. of Charles V. vol. ii. p. 188.

† Dr. Stock, p. 31.



What shall ~~we~~ we say of the founder of the church of England, if Henry VIII. be the founder of it? He had also a beauteous Queen, and he made her shed tears—but he mingled her tears with her blood on a scaffold. Or, is Cranmer rather the founder? Did he not make his sovereign shed tears, the innocent and amiable Edward VI. The Queen of Scots shed tears for the severity of reproof, which might have been salutary: Edward shed tears of humanity and compassion, when Cranmer forced him to sign a warrant, reluctantly, to commit an unhappy woman to the flames: and yet the heart of the archbishop relented not—it was not softened into compassion by the tears of youth and innocence in this amiable prince—yet I can discern the virtues of the archbishop, and mourn over his weakness and his crimes, and over his worst of crimes, persecution.\*

*Note*  
31.

Queen Elizabeth put the unfortunate Queen of Scots to a tragical death, after a captivity, and rigorous confinement of many years, attended with many circumstances of disgrace and indignity: and yet the name of Elizabeth is much revered by good churchmen. Is our author of a different opinion? And does he think it “an act of patience to name her without some note of dislike?”

Ambrose, bishop of Milan, thought it his duty to call his sovereign, the Emperor Theodosius, to account for the abuse, as he thought, of his imperial authority, arraigned him for cruelty, sat in judgment upon his sovereign, and condemned him to do public penance in the church;  
or

\* Hume's History of England, vol. IV. p. 279.

or as Dr. Stock has so handsomely expressed it, *note*  
 “ brought him to the stool of repentance in a *31 B.*  
 “ trice.” And for this act of discipline he was *at the*  
 praised by his cotemporaries, and is praised in our *2nd. p. 6.*  
 day.\*

St. Chrysostom, with more than the haughtiness of the Presbyterian reformer, expostulates with and reproves his sovereign Arcadius, and involves his country in a civil war to suppress a sect which he disliked.†

Dr. Stock may perhaps, reprobate the conduct of these worthy bishops, and think it “ an act of patience to name” any of them as well as Knox, “ without some note of dislike;” if not, it may be worth his while to examine whether his different feelings be directed by wisdom, or by prejudice.

But still this is wide of the subject in question, and is merely personal. Others may judge very differently of the character of the Scottish reformer. The conduct of his unfortunate Queen was not always marked with the strictest prudence, and on many occasions might have given too much room for the admonitions of a faithful subject. But be this as it may, it is more material to observe the temper and spirit of the leaders of the party, and Knox was the principal; and we are told, that “ in spite of the “ murmurs of the people, and the exclamations of the preachers, they obtained for the “ Queen and her domestics the undisturbed “ exercise of the Catholic religion. Near an “ hundred years after this period, when the violence

\* Sozomeni. Hist. Eccl. p. 744, 761. † Ibid.



A . . . lence of religious animosities had begun to  
 " subside, when time and the progress of learn-  
 ing had enlarged the views of the human  
*Note.* " mind, an English House of Commons re-  
 31. C. " fused to indulge the wife of their sovereign  
 " in the private use of the masks. The Protestant  
 " leaders deserve, on this occasion, the praise  
 " both of wisdom and moderation for conduct so  
 " different."\*

Our author censures the churches of Scotland and Geneva for prohibiting theatrical entertainments and dancing. It is useless to dwell on these things, as they have no reference to our argument, and are only introduced to divert the attention from it.

It will be enough to observe, that dancing, which we commonly esteem a very innocent, as well as pleasing amusement, was not always judged of so favourably. The early fathers, who are looked up to by high-churchmen with so much veneration, as the standard of excellence, inveigh against it with great bitterness. Of whom it may be sufficient to adduce the authority of two, dignified with the title of saints, Ambrose and Chrysostom.† And this condemnation does not rest merely on the opinion of particular saints, but as ancient councils are of supreme authority, so we find them sometimes condemning heresy, and sometimes by their canons condemning dancing.‡

As

\* Robertson's Hist. of Scotland, vol. i. p. 145.

† Ambrose de Virginibus, lib. iii. p. 87, 88. Also Sermo 17, where he speaks against dancing and feasting at Christmas. Chrysostom, Serm. 62. See, also, Observations on public dancing Assemblies, in a book entitled, Elegant Extracts, p. 522.

‡ Council of Laodicea, anno 367.

As to theatrical entertainments, we will not appeal to ecclesiastics of ancient or modern times; or strengthen their decisions by the authority of those, who deprived Heliogorus for his *æthiopics*, because these may be objected to as too rigid and severe. But, as this is an entertainment in which elegance of taste and beauty of composition are supposed to be carried to their highest perfection, the opinion of those who have arrived at excellence or even reached the sublime in these admired compositions, is rather to be taken, and may possibly weigh more, if not to support the judgment of Geneva and Scotland, yet at least to shew that it is not to be lightly censured. The elegant Racine, in his mature age, condemned his own tragedies, which were then and still are so much admired: he thought them profane, and wished it was in his power entirely to suppress them.\* The English reader may judge of them by one that is admirably translated into our language, the Distressed Mother, which is so much praised by the Spectator, and has been so well received on our theatres.

*Note*  
33.

*Note B.*  
33.  
*at the end*  
*page 56.*

But, for a particular examination of this question, I would refer to two writers, distinguished for their taste and elegant manner; I mean the celebrated J. J. Rousseau, and M. d'Alembert. One of these, Rousseau, spent a great part of his life in the service of the theatre, and writing for it, but has defended his country, Geneva, for not allowing it to be introduced in-

to

\* Ceux qui savent dans quels sentimens de vertu & de religion Racine a fini ses jours, ne seront sans doute étonnés ni de l'espece d'indifference qu'il a témoignée dans ses vingt dernières années sur ses tragedies profanes, qu'il auroit souhaité pouvoir anéantir. *Memoirs sur la vie de Racine*, p. 37.



to their city. He thinks it ought not to be allowed among a virtuous people, and should only be permitted in great populous cities, where the manners of the people are already very corrupt. The encomium of our author on the ingenious Mr. Hume, I will readily concur in: but whoever examines M. d'Alembert's answer, will be apt to think that it will require even greater abilities than his, to obviate the objections of Rousseau. Another thing worthy of attention in the argument of these ingenious men, is, the manner of conducting it, full of ease and liberality, trusting to their abilities, without assuming any thing from their acknowledged rank in the literary world; which, it is complained, has not been the case with all who have engaged in the present controversy; some of whom have descended to such arts as cannot give the public a favourable opinion of the cause they have engaged in.

The candid will observe, that “ in passing judgment upon the characters of men, we ought to try them by the principles and maxims of their own age, not by those of another. For, although virtue and vice are at all times the same, manners and customs vary continually.” This observation, which a judicious historian has made on Luther, is equally applicable to Knox. A man enervated with the sloth and indolence of modern manners, cannot easily enter into the exertions of a bold, vigorous mind. “ Some parts of his behaviour, which to us appear most culpable, gave no disgust to his contemporaries. It was even by some of those qualities, which we are now apt to blame, that he was fitted for accomplishing the great work which he undertook. To rouse  
“ mankind

" mankind, when sunk in ignorance or supersti-  
 " tion, and to encounter the rage of bigotry  
 " armed with power, required the utmost vehe-  
 " mence of zeal, and a temper daring to excess.  
 " A gentle call would neither have reached, nor  
 " have excited those to whom it was addressed.  
 " A spirit more amiable, but less vigorous, would  
 " have shrunk back from the dangers, which he  
 " braved and surmounted."\*

A man bred up under the authority of eccle-  
 siastical establishments, and habituated from his  
 early youth to an uniform sameness of acting and  
 thinking, and finding his interest and his preju-  
 dices strongly linked together to chain him down  
 to a servile dependence on his superiors, cannot  
 easily raise himself to that dignity of thought  
 which would lead him to admire those exalted  
 characters that have been the reformers of man-  
 kind at different periods of the world, in religion  
 and in the advancement of learning. Nor will  
 he be inclined to discern, or to dwell upon, the  
 excellence of such characters, if they have not  
 contributed to the establishment of his favourite  
 system. Galileo was as obnoxious to the true  
 sons of church, as the amiable Cartwright, or  
 the hated Puritans : and yet one advanced philo-  
 sophy, the other religion and civil liberty. To  
 those who are acquainted with the history of phi-  
 losophy and religion, from the days of Socrates  
 till now, these things are familiar.

Little minds pace on in the beaten track—sel-  
 fish minds pursue steadily their interest—ambiti-  
 ous men their power and greatness, either op-  
 posing, or indifferent to these great and import-

Q

ant

\* Robertson's Hist. of Charles V. vol. ii. p. 189.



ant truths, that fill the soul of exalted characters, who amidst every opposition from the ignorance, and bigotry, and terrors of the world, prevail at length, and lead mankind forward towards perfection.

note  
32.

Dr. Stock tells us, that in the opinion of Charles II. the church of Scotland is not a *religion for gentlemen* :\* for this very *liberal* writer is studious to omit nothing that might be offensive.

But, how was Charles II. qualified to judge of religion ? or why is his opinion adduced as a standard of any authority ? Was it for his piety, his love of truth, or those honourable qualities that ought to adorn a king and a gentleman ? It would have been useful to tell us, what he or this king meant by a gentleman. Was it a man of gay and profligate character, that held every thing sacred in contempt—capable of the basest hypocrisy—dissimulation—and the breach of the most sacred obligations human and divine—then, indeed, Presbyterianism is not the religion of such a gentleman. And it is said, this was the fashionable character of some that were accounted the most accomplished gentlemen of Charles's court. His majesty's character is sufficiently known.

But, if by a gentleman is meant, a man of a certain dignity of character—of a well cultivated understanding—elegance of manners—knowledge of the world, and of the duties he owes to his God, to mankind, and to his country, and thinks it a sacred obligation to perform these duties—then such a man might be of the Presbyterian church,

\* Dr. Stock, p. 28.

church, notwithstanding the opinion of this *pious* king.

The most accomplished gentlemen in France composed the court of Henry king of Navarre, afterwards the greatest of the kings of France, and they were Presbyterians. The young Duke de la Rochefoucault is mentioned as the most elegant and accomplished gentleman, and is particularly lamented even by his assassins in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. But why need we speak of individuals: will not the kings of Prussia, the princes of the illustrious house of Orange, and so many sovereign princes in Germany, furnish many instances of gentlemen that were Presbyterians.

Why did not our author tell us, also, what he and his *pious* king meant by *the religion of a gentleman*. Was it an indifference, or contempt of every thing sacred and venerable?—Was it the religion of Hobbs, that is, the established religion, or superstition of every country, no matter what it be?—Or, was it the religion of Loyola, which he is said to have liked as well as his brother, James II. though he was too much a gentleman to profess openly the religion he believed.\*

We hear of a divine Teacher of religion, who was despised, because none of the rulers, or fine gentlemen among the Jews, believed in him.—And we know his religion was foolishness to the Greeks, who were certainly very fine gentlemen.

Q 2

But,

\* See the French Ambassador's account of Charles II. professing the Roman Catholic religion when dying. Original Papers, appendix to Sir J. Dalrymple's Memoirs.



But, how is it we are to understand this observation of this *pious* king? It would seem to have just as much sense and consistency as the observations of his grandfather, which are adduced by our author from the *Basilicon Doron*.\* James I. had interposed with Queen Elizabeth in favour of the Puritans—in 1590, he praised “ God that  
 “ he was king of the sincerest kirk in the world.  
 “ As for our neighbour kirk of England, their  
 “ service is an evil said mass in English: they  
 “ want nothing of the mass but the liftings. I  
 “ charge you, my good people, ministers, doctors,  
 “ elders, nobles, *gentlemen*, and barons, to  
 “ stand to your purity, and to exhort the people  
 “ to do the same; and I forsooth, so long as I  
 “ brook my life and crown, shall maintain the  
 “ same.

In another speech in 1598, he declared, he minded not to bring in “ papistical, or *Anglican* bishops.” And at this time, we may suppose, he was writing his *Doron Basilicon*, for it was published the year following, and seems plainly to have been a piece of *king-craft*, upon which he valued himself so much, calculated to ingratiate himself with England, and recommend him to the crown of that kingdom.

And still more, after the death of Queen Elizabeth, and even after he was proclaimed King of England, in his harangue at Edinburgh, “ he thanked God, that he had settled both kirk  
 “ and kingdom, and left them in that state,  
 “ which he intended not to hurt, or alter any  
 “ ways.”†

And

\* Dr. Stock, p. 38.

† Cald. Hist. p. 286, 418, 473.

And yet upon his coming to England, and finding the bishops forward to advance all his notions of arbitrary power, he became violent not only against the English Puritans, but against the church of Scotland. And in his first speech to parliament, he acknowledged the church of Rome to be our mother church, although defiled with some corruptions. In promoting bishops, he had a greater regard to such " as would yield a *servile* compliance with his *absolute* commands, than to such as would be an example to the people of religion and virtue. The fashionable doctrines at court were such as the old English clergy thought were subversive of the reformation. The new bishops admitted the church of Rome to be a true church: and the Pope to be the first bishop of Christendom. They declared for the lawfulness of images in churches; for the real presence. They pleaded for confession to a priest; for sacerdotal absolution. They claimed an uninterrupted succession of the episcopal character from the apostles through the church of Rome, which obliged them to maintain the validity of her ordinations, when they denied the validity of those of the foreign Protestants.\*

" Hence, we are told, the Puritan party gathered such strength, and was in such reputation

\* The English reformers held a very different doctrine concerning ordination. In a select assembly of divines, convened by authority of Edward VI. Archbishop Cranmer being president, it was held, that " a bishop may make a priest by the Scripture. 2. So may princes and governors also, and that by the authority of God committed to them. And, 3. The people also by their election.— In the New Testament he that is appointed bishop or priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture: for election or appointing thereto is sufficient." Extract from Cranmer's M.S. in Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*. c. viii.



“ tion with the people, that they were more in  
 “ number than all the other parties in the king-  
 “ dom put together.”\* Here we see the founda-  
 tion laid for the overthrow of this church and mo-  
 narchy in the ensuing reign, as his son unhappily  
 pursued the same maxims. Bishop Burnet says,  
 “ James was the scorn of the age, a mere  
 “ pedant, without true judgment, courage or  
 “ steadiness: his reign being a continued course  
 “ of mean practices.”

Such was the man whose authority the Bishop  
 of Cloyne and Dr. Stock have been forward to  
 appeal to. And the learned Doctor assures us,  
 that “ though he was not a Solomon, he was far  
 “ enough from being a *fool*.”

Dr. Stock goes on to charge the church of  
 Scotland with a most violent spirit of persecution  
 —“ of this *I am certain*, that in her cradle the  
 “ young heroine was as ready as Hercules to  
 “ strangle serpents without regard to their mag-  
 “ nitude or number.”†

Here, we are entertained with fable and  
 metaphor instead of history. On which I would  
 just observe, that figurative language, by dis-  
 playing variety of images to the fancy, is used,  
 either to please the imagination, or to illustrate  
 the subject, or to add energy and vigour to ar-  
 gument; but is strangely misplaced when brought  
 in to divert the mind from historical truth. This  
 is not to illustrate, but to lead astray. Ac-  
 cordingly, we find not a single fact adduced to  
 justify this description.

Besides,

\* Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 127.

† Dr. Stock, p. 31.

Besides, there is a certain correctness of of imagery that cannot be dispensed with in just composition. That rule is here transgressed, and the imagery presented to us is full of incorrectness and inconsistency. The unconscious efforts of simplicity and innocence, of a child in its cradle, is set forth by our ingenious author as the emblem of persecution. A temper relentless and cruel, brooding over torture and death, destroying the virtuous or the innocent, is represented by an infant undesigning and innocent, who destroys without knowing it, his enemies sent for his destruction. This, if I remember right, is the story of Hercules strangling serpents in his cradle. And when he wielded his club, it was in the achievement of noble enterprize, and sometimes in rescuing from injury and wrong. So that if the hero is to be pressed into the service, he should be taken not in a state of innocence, but in his phrenzy and madness, when it might have been dangerous to approach him.

Our author, then, does not appear to be very fortunate in his first essay to fix the stain of persecution on the church of Scotland by the power of fiction in opposition to history, which gives a very different account of the infancy of this church.

1. Hamilton, a young gentleman of noble birth, was the first who suffered in Scotland for the Protestant religion, in 1527. From his death, thirty years elapsed, and during so long a period, no violation of public order or tranquillity had proceeded from that sect. And though irritated by the most cruel excesses of the then Popish ecclesiastical tyranny, they did, *in no instance*, transgress those bounds of duty which the law prescribes



prescribes to subjects. And among a people bred to arms, and so prone to mutiny as the Scots; and in an age when religious passions had taken such strong possession of the human mind, and moved and agitated it with so much violence; the peaceable and regular demeanour of so numerous a party was truly astonishing.\*

Dr. Stock says, "in her very *infancy* she made " a longer stride in the paths of intolerance than " *any other* of the reformed churches ever " ventured on.† Need we mention the fires ■ lighted in Smithfield by the church of Eng- ■ land, under Henry VIII. and Edward VI.?

2. We are told, that in the ardour of reformation, and whilst the utmost excesses were committed upon the churches and monasteries, (1559) the leaders of the CONGREGATION not only acted with humanity themselves, but so far restrained the rage of their followers, and were able so to temper their heat and zeal, that few of the Roman Catholics were exposed to any personal insult, and *not a single man* suffered death‡—and that they obtained for the Queen and her domestics the undisturbed exercise of the Catholic religion. Upon this instance of moderation so different from the manners of the times, the historian observes, as we took notice of before, that near an hundred years after this period, an English House of Commons refused to indulge their Queen in the private use of the mass.

Note

31. C.

Dr Stock, however, assures us, that "scarce-  
" ly had the new religion gathered consistency  
" in

\* Robertson's History of Scotland, vol. i. p. 90.

† Dr. Stock, p. 53, 55.

‡ Robertson's Hist. vol. i. p. 102, 145.

“ in Scotland, when it poured the storm of per-  
 “ secution upon all who refused to abjure the  
 “ old one, from the *sovereign* to the meanest  
 “ subject.”\*

3. When England was threatened with the Spanish armada, Huntley, Errol, and others of the Popish lords, were the heads of a faction, which openly espoused the interest of Spain. In the following year they all engaged in a correspondence with the Prince of Parma, and offered their service to the King of Spain, and undertook not only to assist him in the *conquest* of Scotland, but to bring so many of their vassals into the field, that he should be able to enter England with a numerous army. This conspiracy being discovered, a short imprisonment was the only punishment inflicted by King James on Huntley and his associates. But, he soon had reason to repent an act of clemency so inconsistent with the dignity of government. The first use which the conspirators made of their liberty, was to assemble their followers and attempt to seize the king. But being defeated in their attempt, they openly erected the standard of rebellion. The king in person marched against them—obliged them to surrender, and throw themselves on his mercy. They were all brought to a public trial. Repeated acts of treason were easily proved against them. The king, however, after a few months confinement, amidst the public rejoicings at the approach of his marriage, set them at liberty.

The nation was kept in continual terror and agitation by so many successive conspiracies, which still continued. From men under the do-  
 R minion

\* Dr. Stock, p. 53.



*The king*

minion of bigotry; and whom indulgence could not reclaim, the most desperate actions were to be dreaded. A parliament was called which declared them guilty of high treason, and their estates and honours forfeited. ~~He~~ was obliged again to take the field in person; and having reduced the Popish lords to submission, he shewed them so much lenity as to permit them to go beyond seas, upon condition that they should not return without his licence, nor engage in any new intrigue against the Protestant religion, or the peace of the kingdom.\*

This in the language of Dr. Stock, is a "storm of persecution." And yet in our memory, Scottish noblemen for their treason and rebellion, have met with very different measure. They were not merely imprisoned, nor were they permitted to go into voluntary exile, but the sentence of parliament was executed in that manner which the dignity of government required. And yet this was not deemed "a storm of persecution."—In England there were frequent Popish conspiracies at this period, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, but we find no such lenity shewn as was in Scotland. The Duke of Norfolk, who was brought to the scaffold, Northumberland and many others, can abundantly witness.

Our author would insinuate very plainly, that the imprisonment and exile of the Popish lords was occasioned by the intolerant spirit of the Presbyterian church; whereas the fact was directly the reverse.† They were not driven into rebellion

\* Robertson, vol. ii. p. 49, 54, 60, 61.

† It is worthy of notice, that the imprisonment and banishment of a *Presbyterian* minister, Melvil, is treated by our author

lion by persecution, nor even by the censures of the church, but *these* were pronounced because of their frequent rebellions, and not till after they were convicted, repeatedly, on trial. It was not till five or six years after the beginning of these conspiracies, that the clergy thought themselves bound, in such a juncture, to take *extraordinary* steps for the preservation of the Protestant religion. And the motion for excommunication was made, *expressly*, on account of the late conspiracies.\* Excommunication had civil penalties annexed to it of a very serious nature: and if such things can be justified by the advocates of ecclesiastical polity, one would think this a fair instance, where it is exercised against men convicted of frequent, daring rebellions, that threatened the destruction of their country. I have repeatedly declared against all such ecclesiastical power, but objections come with a bad grace from the members of a church, where excommunications are heard of every day, and for such trivial causes as it is shameful to mention.

The account I have given, is taken from the most approved Scottish historian, an author very universally and very justly admired. Our opponent has cited Spotswood, and takes great liberties with him, selecting only such parts as may serve his purpose. Besides, he is particularly fond of using the authority of the most factious par-

R 2

ty

author with an affected levity—"he got himself laid by the heels in the tower—he was packed away to Flanders, where he died."—His crime was dispersing verses against the *rites* of his majesty's chapel, and holding church assemblies contrary to the direction of the king and council.—But the compassionate Doctor mourns over the banishment of the heads of the *Popish* faction, whose lives were forfeited for frequent rebellions. P. 43 and 54.

\* Robertson's Hist. of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 57, 69.



ty writers, with whose virulence he seems wonderfully delighted, and therefore deals out their invectives with a very liberal hand. The *opinions* of such men we must accept, instead of historical truth. Declamation must supply the want of facts, and a charge of persecution against the Presbyterians of Scotland, of which history is silent, must be supported by a profusion of words, and high sounding metaphors. In Ireland, he says, they never had power; and yet he has censured them for exerting their power in support of the constitution, during the convulsions of the state in the last century. He is precluded, he says, by some "dextrous limitation" from passing into England, but flies across the Atlantic into America—speaks of lions roaring in concert in Africa\*—and of lions eating mutton in the tower—which bold similies, expressed no doubt with classical elegance, he has supplied in support of his charge of persecution against Presbyterians. It would be idle to enter into a contest of words. To this, therefore, it may be enough to apply the observation of CHILLINGWORTH, in his dedication to Charles I. "It is  
 " an argument of a despairing and lost cause,  
 " to support itself with these impetuous outcries  
 " and clamours; the faint refuges of those that  
 " want better arguments."

I have said that our author has taken great liberties with Spotswood's history, and used it *partially*: of which every one may satisfy himself, who will take the trouble of comparing the passages referred to with his representation of them. Though it is tedious to follow a writer merely to point out such misconstruction, yet it may be useful to mention a few instances, as these will

\* Dr. Stock, p. 55.

will tend to shew how easily we may be led astray should we take our author's account of the character, institution, or history of the Church of Scotland.

Thus he tells us of "the circumstantial malignity of the lay-elder; to pry into the hall or study of their neighbour; to enquire what books he read;"\* and for this he refers us to Spotswood, but conceals his words, which are as follow. "If a minister be of a loose conversation, negligent in his study, and one that waiteth not on his charge and flock, he ought to be admonished by the elders." How widely different is this from that malignity, and *inquisitorial* character the Doctor would put on this office of an elder.

In the following page he refers us to Spotswood, but what he mentions is not to be found in the place referred to. He next tells us, "at one stroke she excommunicated all the Roman Catholics in Scotland, who did not after lawful admonition abjure their papistical and blasphemous mass, as she termed it."†

Spotswood's words are, "Some acts of discipline were also concluded, viz. in the assembly; as that Papists continuing obstinate after lawful admonitions *shall be* excommunicated." This was not excommunicating any, much less all the Roman Catholics in Scotland; it was only granting a power to excommunicate such persons as should, after lawful admonition, continue obstinate. This *lawful* admonition implied a citation before a court, and a conviction upon evidence,

\* Dr. Stock, p. 29.

† Ibid. p. 31.



dence, and therefore must refer to individuals and not to aggregate bodies.

“ In three instances, where James I. was compelled by the times, and by the weakness of the crown to refer himself to their decision, they did *absolve* very flagrant offenders.”\*—— Then we are referred to Spotswood for the cases of Gibson, Rosse, and Blake,

But he is expressly contradicted by the authority to which he appeals. “ As the chancellor, says Spotswood, was directed, he shewed the assembly that the king did expect a reparation of the offence committed by Gibson, for he had obtained his liberty upon promise that he should give satisfaction at the church’s sight. Hereupon the minister was called, who acknowledged his offence, and was enjoined the next sermon day to preach and publicly acknowledge the speeches complained of to have been unadvised and rashly uttered. This he promised to do; yet when he came to the place, he made no mention at all of that business. And being immediately charged for not doing as he had promised, he answered that out of infirmity and weakness he had confessed a fault, albeit his conscience did tell him he had not spoken any thing that might give just offence. The chancellor perceiving the man’s inconstancy, and that he had been diverted by some ill-disposed persons, required the judgment of the assembly, whether or not they did esteem it an offence to call the king a persecutor of the church, and to affirm in pulpit that he should be the last of the race. The question was a while declined; yet in  
“ the

\* Dr. Stock, p. 34.

“ the end being put to voices, it was found that  
 “ the speeches were slanderous and offensive, and  
 “ and that he ought therefore to be *censured*.

“ It being then twelve of the clock, the de-  
 “ fining of the censure was continued to the af-  
 “ ternoon, and the minister warned to attend.  
 “ The hour came and he not appearing, the busi-  
 “ ness was greater than before: some alleging  
 “ that citation must be used ere any censure was  
 “ inflicted: others excused his absence upon  
 “ just fear, being pursued by so great personages.  
 “ Hereto it was replied, that there was no fear  
 “ of any indirect or violent course to be taken;  
 “ the king, *who by his own authority might have*  
 “ *punished him*, having for the regard he carried to  
 “ the church, chused to complain to the assem-  
 “ bly, and remit the offender to be censured by  
 “ themselves.

“ Next for the citation required, it was  
 “ answered, that the warning given him in the  
 “ face of the assembly was sufficient, and that by  
 “ his not appearing he had added *contumacy* to  
 “ his *offence*. These answers being held suffi-  
 “ cient, and the voices asked touching his cen-  
 “ sure, by the greater numbers he was ordained  
 “ to be *suspended* from the ministry during the  
 “ pleasure of the assembly.”

So far Spotswood; and this Dr. Stock has call-  
 ed “ *absolving* very flagrant offenders.” He says  
 also, that “ the king was compelled by the  
 “ *weakness* of the crown to refer himself to their  
 “ decision.” The assembly expressly contradict  
 this; they say, “ that by his own authority he  
 “ might have punished him.”

At



At the next assembly, Spotswood informs us, that Gibson "was purged of the *contumacy*," but not of the offence against the king: that this was done without "acquainting the king: " that his majesty was offended at this, and the " minister fled to England, and remained there a " long space."

With respect to Rosse, the historian says," The " king sent certain instructions to the assembly; " whereof one was that they should inhibit the " ministers to utter any irreverent speeches in " pulpit against his majesty's person, council, or " estate, under pain of deprivation: and because " one of their number called John Rosse, had " in a sermon preached before the synod of " Perth, uttered divers treasonable and irreverent " speeches of his majesty, it was craved that " they should censure him as his fault had de- " served. Complaint was also made against one " Hunter, and some acts of assembly required. " The act was assented to, and Hunter *deposed* " from the ministry. But the *censure* of Rosse " was carried more slightly, and he only ad- " monished to speak in time coming so reverently " and discreetly of his majesty, as there might " be no just cause of complaint against him."

Here again, our opponent is contradicted by the authority to which he appeals. We see they were so far from "absolving flagrant offenders," that they inflicted censures upon them; a slight one on Rosse, which, however, because of their severity on Hunter, we may suppose, was adequate to his offence.

This happened in the year 1594. And to judge of these extraordinary appearances, we should at-  
tend

tend to the state of public affairs, and the conduct of the king; who at this time, by his lenity towards the Popish conspirators, had incurred much reproach, and had filled the nation with jealousy, perhaps, to excess, that his affections leaned too much towards the Popish faction. Queen Elizabeth was so much alarmed, as to think her interposition necessary. She, also, imputed his reluctance to punish the Popish lords to a secret *approbation* of their designs, and “sent to Lord Zouche to represent once more, the danger to which he exposed himself by this false moderation; and to require him to exercise that rigour which their *crimes*, as well as the posture of affairs rendered necessary.”\* We may the less wonder, then, if amidst this general alarm, one or two of the clergy were hurried on by their zeal to transgress the bounds of duty, though at the same time we find the readiness of the church to punish them.

The conference between the king and some of the ministers, in Blake's affair, is fairly transcribed from Spotswood, so far as Dr. Stock thought fit to give it; but by giving only a small part, the conduct of the ministers is, perhaps, set in a worse point of view than if the whole was related. The jealousy of the nation was again roused against the king in regard to his attachment to popery. “A committee, consisting of the most eminent clergymen, and of many barons, and gentlemen of distinction, waited on the king, and laid before him a plan for the security of the kingdom, and the preservation of religion,”† which his conduct, in their opinion,

S

rendered

\* Robertson's History of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 58, 59.

† Ibid. p. 63.



rendered necessary. And from two proclamations he had published some time before, they thought he meant to abridge the privileges of the church, to promote the *designs* he had in view, and therefore they contended earnestly against his getting too much power in ecclesiastical affairs. But, they did not, as Dr. Stock asserts, absolve Blake; on the contrary, they inflicted the very punishment upon him which the king desired.

Were it not to rescue history from misrepresentation, and to shew how groundless the inferences are which our author has drawn from such a source, to the prejudice of the Presbyterians of Ireland, I could not be induced to pursue this tedious business. But these considerations will apologize to the reader, while I go on in this ungrateful task to point out a few more instances, by which we may be able to judge how far the learned Doctor had any accurate knowledge of the subject he wrote upon, and how far we can place any dependence upon his account of the history and constitution of the church of Scotland.

Speaking of one of the ministers, he says, “ his  
 “ opinion concerning the indefeisible right of  
 “ the kirk to convene assemblies in despite of the  
 “ civil authority did not die with him : it stood  
 “ its ground courageously against all the vicissitudes  
 “ of after times.”\*

We know that during the three first centuries the christian church convened assemblies, though they were dissenters from every *established* church, so far as we have any account, and though they were often persecuted by the civil authority.  
 Christians

\* Dr. Stock, p. 43.

Christians thought they were under a sacred obligation to convene such assemblies. Their right, *they thought* was derived from the founder of their religion, and therefore has been called an *inherent* right of the church. This was particularly mentioned in the VINDICATION, and if our author thought it was wrong, why did he not controvert it. Or, if he approved it in the primitive church, why did he not tell us his reasons for censuring it in later ages, or at present. Why did he not tell us, when this right was forfeited: whether it was, as soon as the civil magistrate became christian. But, we know, the church, at that time, did not think so, for we find many assemblies and councils convened without his authority,\* and the emperors taking no offence, as if their authority was despised, or their privileges invaded.

But, our author without assigning any reason, would condemn the idea, of this being an *indefeasible* right of christians, and is highly pleased with Cromwell for dismissing the general assembly of Scotland for sitting without his warrant. Cromwell and his secretary Milton, are appealed to as standards in their judgment and conduct in ecclesiastical matters, so far as relates to Presbyterians: are they equally so, in our author's opinion, in regard to Episcopalians? "The protector's absolutely forbidding the clergy of every denomination to deal in *politics*, as not belonging to their profession," he seems highly to approve; does he think it reaches my lords the bishops and the system of his patron, or is it only right when applied to Presbyterians?

S 2

However,

\* Vide Socrat. and Sozomen, passim.



However, the opinion "courageously held its ground against all the vicissitudes of after times," and in support of this, he entertains us with some very *witty stories* of some of the moderators of the general assembly in the reign of King William, adjusting the dispute "concerning the prerogative royal of calling, adjourning and dissolving assemblies." But, would it not have been more satisfactory and more suitable to the character of a man of letters, to have examined the constitution of the church, and to have laid it before his readers, and there he would have found in their confession of faith, that "the civil magistrate hath power to call synods, to be present at them, and to provide that whatsoever is transacted in them be according to the mind of God." Chap. xxiii. And in regard to what he has advanced in his 41st page, he might have found, that it is the doctrine of that church, that, "they who upon pretence of christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God." Chap. xx.

In both these passages, what is adduced by our author as taken from Spotswood, is taken only in parts to serve his purpose. So it is, in like manner, in pages 51, in the notes, 54, 56, 97, 110.—In this last page, he says, the advocates for presbytery "undertake to shew a *jus divinum* for its pretensions, a charter from Christ himself, of which human law may interrupt the exercise, but cannot take away the right."

But, what are its pretensions, or where are its claims of power, which disturbed the "peace of society."

“ society.” We have just cited her doctrines, and see they are the very reverse. The claims of power, and *jus divinum*, for which our author refers us to Spotswood, is contained in a form of church polity presented to parliament in the year 1578. In the first head of that polity, article 8th and 9th, is laid down the different nature of civil and ecclesiastical power. A committee of parliament was appointed to confer with the commissioners of the church, and if they did agree, to insert the same among the acts of parliament. Upon some articles they agreed, some they altered, and some they left for farther consideration. In regard to the 9th, which, I suppose, is the article our author points at, they made it run thus, “ this power ecclesiastical is *spiritual*, not having temporal head in the earth, but only Christ, the only *spiritual* king and governor of the church.”\*

This business was never brought to a conclusion : but we may observe, that so far from claiming a *divine right* of presbytery, or any claims of power which might disturb the state, the whole matter was submitted to the state, and only the *general* nature of ecclesiastical power is spoken of, and presbytery is not so much as mentioned in this form of polity.

“ At the æra of the reformation in Scotland,  
 “ the kirk deprived the Popish clergy of a third  
 “ part of their benefices, which was granted to  
 “ the crown.”† But

\* The 9th article at first ran thus. For this power ecclesiastical floweth from God immediately, and the Mediator Jesus Christ, and is *spiritual*, not having temporal head in the earth, but only Christ, the only *spiritual* king and governor of the church.”

† Dr. Stock, p. 96.



But Spotswood, to whom our author refers us, says, " the court was busied in a consultation  
 " how to supply the charge of the queen's house,  
 " which the ordinary revenues could not so honourably maintain as was required. Divers  
 " being thought upon, the readiest seemed to fall  
 " upon the church-rents, and draw somewhat  
 " from the prelates and beneficed persons."——  
 Here there is not one word of the kirk, or clergy, but of the court only.

In pursuing the history of this church, our author observes, that the behaviour of "*two* ministers at Edinburgh, in the year 1584, made  
 " it necessary at length for the Scotch parliament to pass an express act in favour of violated rights of monarchy."\*

And herein they acted wisely ; and every government should be particularly attentive to suppress the arrogance of churchmen. But, how is it that our opponent does not discern, that this instance does not at all tend to support his argument? A presbyterian parliament repressed the insolent pretensions of *two* ministers, and provided against such unbecoming conduct of any member of their church in time to come. But, did they condemn and abolish the order of presbytery, as an episcopal parliament in England condemned and abolished episcopacy, as unfriendly to religion, and as a fit engine of tyranny? They did the reverse ; they supported the order as friendly to religion and to civil liberty.†

In his review of this history, he has cautiously avoided that part to which his attention was particularly

\* Dr. Stock, p. 38. † Robertson, vol. ii. p. 53.

ticularly called ; that is, the persecutions during the reigns of Charles II. and James II.—A scene which fills the mind with horror; in which we see Protestant bishops, assisted by a Popish prince, the Duke of York, inflicting on Protestant dissenters various species of torture and of death, and which only ended with the power of the bishops to inflict them.\* Since he entered into the history of Scotland, why did he not do it fairly and impartially? Why would he endeavour to fix the crime of persecution on the Presbyterians, of which we find no trace in history, whilst at the same time he would cover the evil deeds of the worst of men? How far is this conduct below the ingenuity of certain Roman Catholic writers on the massacre of Paris? Some of whom have told us, that to efface the memory of such foul disgrace, every good Frenchman would redeem the honour of his country with his blood. Our author makes no apology—he seems rather to lament that such men had lost their power and their benefices, and yet one would rather wonder that they had not been banished from their country as a public nuisance, as we have seen a certain learned society,† in our day banished from several countries of Europe; who, if they were not chargeable with fewer vices, had at least more virtues to recommend them.

But

\* See the History of the Persecutions in Scotland, by Woodrow, Crookshanks, &c. And if it would be more satisfactory to high-churchmen, they may see it written by one of great authority among them. Dean Swift has entered into a detail of many of these cruelties, dwells upon them with malignant pleasure, and viewing them with cool reflection, after many years had elapsed, could prostitute his abilities to add insult and contempt to the misery and wretchedness those unhappy sufferers endured in so tedious and unrelenting a persecution. In his historical works, the Memoirs of Cap. Creighton.

† The Jesuits.

*Note*  
34

*Note*  
49.



But more than enough has been said to shew how very imperfect, and how partial his account is of the church of Scotland. And should all that he has said be granted him, it will shew that prelacy, in a point of view merely political, is either *essential* to our civil constitution, or to be desired, or at all to be preferred to the Presbyterian. For he has not attempted to shew, in any instance, that presbytery was hurtful to civil liberty, or to our constitution. Nor has he attempted to shew, that prelacy was not hurtful to both.

And still further, should it be allowed, that *both* churches abused power when in possession of it, this will so far confirm my principle, that power should not be vested in the hands of churchmen of any denomination.

Our author says, however, that to infer “ that churchmen abused their power because they were churchmen, is lame and unphilosophical. Men do not make a perverse use of overgrown power, because they are of this or that sect or profession, but because they are *men*.”\*

It is not easy to discern what our author means in this passage. The Bishop of Cloyne says, popery is “ a congenial system of arbitrary dominion.” But, his apologist will tell him, that to say Roman Catholics are led, by their being of a particular sect, to the abuse of power, is *lame* and *unphilosophical*—his Lordship should have said, it is because they are *men*.

These general abstract notions lead us into error, or uncertain disputation, and seldom afford

\* Dr. Stock, p. 107.

ford any instruction. The word *churchman*, considered abstractedly, conveys to us, I suppose, the idea of a minister of religion, without any mixture of political power. Now, to say that churchmen abused *overgrown power* because they were churchmen, must be *lame* indeed, for it is saying, they abused what they are supposed not to have.

But, it would seem, that *philosophy* would lead us to say, they abused it "because they are men." What are we to understand by this? Is it, that it is the nature of man to abuse power? Then injustice, oppression, tyranny is natural to man. And then, on the other hand, it must be equally natural to every man to oppose such abuse of power. This would introduce a state of universal war of all against all, as the natural state of man. This wretched system has indeed been dignified with the name of philosophy. It was the philosophy of Hobbs in the last century; but he had not the honour of the invention—it was held by the ancient sophists in the days of Plato.\* To say that the abuse of power is *natural*, or is connected with the idea of our being *men*, is to maintain that human nature tends to its own misery and destruction, which cannot be *true*, and therefore cannot be *philosophical*.

B. 49.  
p. 7. at the  
end.

The language of philosophy is, that the law of nature makes every thing tend to the preservation of the species—that the primary tendency of all *her* laws, with which we are acquainted, is to happiness and enjoyment. We have public affections which prompt us to pursue the happiness of one another, and furnish us with the joys  
T that

\* Plato, Gorgias. Edit. Ficini. p. 330.



or that

that flow from love and sympathy, from friendship, generosity, and mutual kindness. Therefore, we might argue with much greater truth, and draw the conclusion directly opposite to that of our author, that men make a noble and generous use of power, not "because they are of this sect or profession, but because they are *men*."

But the utility of political institutions is not to be ascertained by arguments drawn from abstract general notions, but from history and experience. Every one knows that certain forms of civil government are less fitted to promote the happiness of mankind than others. So it is of ecclesiastical institutions. And history to which the appeal was made, shews us beyond all doubt, that prelacy in its tendency, is destructive of the happiness of mankind, and that our established hierarchy, in particular, is unfriendly to civil liberty: and, on the other hand, that presbytery, or the primitive institution of the christian church, is friendly to religion and civil liberty, and subservient to the happiness of mankind.

Note

34.

History shews us also, that ecclesiastics are more prone to the abuse of power than other men. That in their hands it assumes a more dreadful appearance than in other men. That to all the motives that influence others to the abuse of power, they join those that are derived from their order. Their superstition, their enthusiasm, their spiritual pride, their peculiar contracted modes of thinking, are all brought in aid to embitter their tyranny. So says Lord Falkland as a statesman: so says Barbeyrac as a philosopher:\* so says the Abbé Rainal as a philosophical

\* Preface to Puffendorf on the Law of Nature and Nations.

phical historian :\*—and to the justness of their opinion all ecclesiastical history bears an ample testimony.

Amidst the reflections our author has entertained us with on the church of Scotland, he is not unmindful of the Presbyterians of Ireland; and has adduced instances of their assaulting the established clergy, in the reign of Queen Anne, as he says, in the exercise of their ministry: for which he gives us the authority of the Bishop of Dromore, and Archdeacon Hamilton. He speaks, also, of Dissenters managing matters with such *artifice* as to obtain a majority of aldermen, burgesses and freemen, through all the considerable corporations of the North of Ireland.

These charges he brings from a libel that has been repeatedly confuted: but he might have supported them by much higher authority, for they had been adduced formerly by high-churchmen, as they are now, to throw aspersions on the whole body of Presbyterians, as he may see in the address of convocation, and other addresses to the queen, where he will find them set forth with all the ill temper, that unhappily disgraced the clergy at that time.

But might we not expect from the liberality our author professes, that he would have considered the answers that were given to these calumnies, and particularly in the several ad-  

T 2
dresses

\* L'oppression n'est que—dans l'incoherence des principes d'une autorité, qui se disant établie de Dieu par l'épée, veut tout prendre avec l'une, & tout ordonner au nom de l'autre; s'armer du glaive dans le sanctuaire, & de la religion dans les tribunaux. Voilà l'oppression. Hist. Philos. & Politique. Tome iii. p. 334.



or that

that flow from love and sympathy; from friendship, generosity, and mutual kindness. Therefore, we might argue with much greater truth, and draw the conclusion directly opposite to that of our author, that men make a noble and generous use of power, not "because they are of this sect or profession, but because they are *men*."

But the utility of political institutions is not to be ascertained by arguments drawn from abstract general notions, but from history and experience. Every one knows that certain forms of civil government are less fitted to promote the happiness of mankind than others. So it is of ecclesiastical institutions. And history to which the appeal was made, shews us beyond all doubt, that prelacy in its tendency, is destructive of the happiness of mankind, and that our established hierarchy, in particular, is unfriendly to civil liberty: and, on the other hand, that presbytery, or the primitive institution of the christian church, is friendly to religion and civil liberty, and subservient to the happiness of mankind.

Note

34.

History shews us also, that ecclesiastics are more prone to the abuse of power than other men. That in their hands it assumes a more dreadful appearance than in other men. That to all the motives that influence others to the abuse of power, they join those that are derived from their order. Their superstition, their enthusiasm, their spiritual pride, their peculiar contracted modes of thinking, are all brought in aid to embitter their tyranny. So says Lord Falkland as a statesman: so says Barbeyrac as a philosopher: \* so says the Abbé Rainal as a philosophical

\* Preface to Puffendorf on the Law of Nature and Nations.

phical historian :\*—and to the justness of their opinion all ecclesiastical history bears an ample testimony.

Amidst the reflections our author has entertained us with on the church of Scotland, he is not unmindful of the Presbyterians of Ireland; and has adduced instances of their assaulting the established clergy, in the reign of Queen Anne, as he says, in the exercise of their ministry: for which he gives us the authority of the Bishop of Dromore, and Archdeacon Hamilton. He speaks, also, of Dissenters managing matters with such *artifice* as to obtain a majority of aldermen, burgesses and freemen, through all the considerable corporations of the North of Ireland.

These charges he brings from a libel that has been repeatedly confuted: but he might have supported them by much higher authority, for they had been adduced formerly by high-churchmen, as they are now, to throw aspersions on the whole body of Presbyterians, as he may see in the address of convocation, and other addresses to the queen, where he will find them set forth with all the ill temper, that unhappily disgraced the clergy at that time.

But might we not expect from the liberality our author professes, that he would have considered the answers that were given to these calumnies, and particularly in the several ad-  
T 2
dresses

\* L'oppression n'est que—dans l'incoherence des principes d'une autorité, qui se disant établie de Dieu par l'épée, veut tout prendre avec l'une, & tout ordonner au nom de l'autre; s'armer du glaive dans le sanctuaire, & de la religion dans les tribunaux. Voila l'oppression. Hist. Philos. & Politique. Tome iii. p. 334.



dressés and apologies presented to her majesty by the Presbyterian ministers and gentlemen in their defence.

“ The archdeacon affirms, the dissenting *preachers* did begin the disturbance and encourage the rabble to that rudeness and violence which they expressed.”—And our author adds, “ the facts themselves were not denied.”\*

Let it be observed, how *well* he is acquainted with these proceedings, and how *well* he is qualified to give an opinion, and to draw inferences from them. The *preachers* are charged with beginning the disturbance—and he says, “ the facts are not *denied*.” But the preachers do expressly *deny* this calumny thrown on them.

“ We beg leave to assure your majesty, that we do not know any instances where ever the ministers of the established church were openly and violently assaulted by us in the discharge of their sacred office ; unless this be understood of some acts of indiscretion, whereof some few of the *meaner* sort were guilty, while the clergy were performing the office for the burial of the dead : which practice, as it is not approved by us, so we believe it has still been punished by the civil magistrate upon conviction.”

It is somewhat curious to hear our author bringing an accusation against Presbyterians for having a majority in the corporations of the North.—For, why should they not, either then, or now ? But, it is said, this was done by *artifice*. That he knows is *denied*, for he has quoted

the

\* Dr. Stock, p. 94.

the *denial*.\* It would have been material, had he shewn that they made a bad use of this majority, to the injury of their country, or of the constitution, and particularly that they were led to make this abuse of it by their political principles derived from their ecclesiastical constitution; otherwise we cannot see to what purpose it is mentioned. But the reverse was the case: all the power and influence they possessed, was devoted in the most determined manner to support the succession in the house of Hanover, which they thought involved in it the happiness of the empire, and the existence of the constitution. This was their crime in the eyes of the high-church clergy, as so many of them opposed this succession with the greatest enmity. For it does not appear that, even, an indiscreet use was made of the majority complained of; it rather appeared disinterested and generous. In their apology to the queen, they say; “we can produce undeniable instances in several towns, particularly in Londonderry and Belfast (the most considerable in Ulster) where the Dissenters chose those of the established church to the chief offices in corporations, when they had interest enough to have elected those of their own communion.”†

And though they had too much reason to know that nothing could recommend them less, yet, with that steadiness, which uniformly distinguishes their character, they do not hesitate to express their sentiments in the plainest terms. “We earnestly entreat your majesty may be still assured—that we own and maintain the justice and necessity of the late happy revolution,  
“ and

\* Dr. Stock, p. 65, in the notes.

† Apology, p. 23.



“ and steadily adhere to the Protestant succession, by our laws happily established in the illustrious house of Hanover.”\*

In regard to the ill conduct of individuals, they observe; “ if such should happen to be discovered afterwards (of which we have not the least suspicion) we humbly conceive it could not be justly turned to our reproach, any more than the scandals of particular men are chargeable upon other communities of which they are members.”†

*Note*  
50.

A few years ago, an unfortunate clergyman suffered the sentence of the law in London. What would our author think, if his crimes should be imputed to the whole body of his brethren? Would any thing appear more iniquitous, when every one knows, they all condemned the conduct of the unhappy sufferer, however they must have been filled with commiseration at the fate of a man, who seemed to be possessed of qualities that might have rendered him an honour to his friends, and an ornament to his profession?

The address of the Irish convocation to the queen would give room for observations of a very different sort, and more intimately connected with our subject; that is, concerning the subserviency of the civil power to the clergy, which has ever been an engine full of danger and cruelty. For they speak of “ the best and holiest princes, in the more early and flourishing ages of the church; who have maintained it in all its rights and privileges; and afforded their aid and assistance in all emergencies; in supporting

\* Apology, p. 30.

† Ibid. p. 22.

“ porting its discipline, confirming and *enforcing*  
 “ *its censures*, and preserving to the governors of it  
 “ inviolable those powers with which Christ had  
 “ entrusted them.”

Here is the principle of ecclesiastical tyranny in all its dimensions: uniting the sword to the church, and making the chief magistrate the *executioner of her censures*.\* Is not this the foundation of the papal power? And will it not exalt the Emperor Sigismund among “the best and “holiest princes” for his filial obedience to the church, and *enforcing the censures* of the council of Constance by burning John Hufs, though he had given him a safe conduct? And is this the ecclesiastical establishment under which we live, and which, in the judgment of the Bishop of Cloyne is *essential* to our civil constitution—or is it, as he asserts of the church of Rome, “a “congenial system of arbitrary dominion?” and therefore inconsistent with a free government.

But, the convocation speaks of “preserving  
 “to the governors of the church those powers  
 “with which Christ had intrusted them.” Now, as the *governors* of the church are here distinguished from the *chief magistrates*, or princes; it is probable, they meant to point out the bishops or clergy as the governors, and that their power was derived from Christ: which is the claim of *divine right*, in direct breach of that constitution under which they lived, and of which they are so fond of boasting, as the most perfect in the world.  
 For

\* Par une collusion sacrilege entre l'autel & le throne, on eut associé Dieu à l'épée, que faisoit la morale de l'Evangile enhardir la tyrannie par l'obeissance passive. Abbé Rainal, Hist. Philos. & Politique. Tome vii. p. 392.



For by this constitution, as ecclesiastical authority is vested in the crown by act of parliament, and as by his commission the king can appoint whom he will, either clergyman, or layman, to *govern* this church and to exercise discipline, and to perform every part of the episcopal office, it is obvious that this government is not derived from Christ, but is as our first reformers taught, of human authority, and might be altered, or formed differently by different states, as they might judge most convenient and useful.

1. Dr. Stock asks,\* “is a religious *establishment* “ necessary to the well-being of a state?”

If by religious establishment is meant the CLERGY, and that they should be vested with political power, or with ecclesiastical power beyond what is given in the New Testament; then such religious establishment is so far from being *necessary* to the well-being of a state, that from the uniform tenor of church history, we are warranted in asserting, that it is detrimental to it, and has been the cause of the greatest misery that has ever desolated the christian world.

2. This will give an easy answer to the Doctor’s second question.—“Can the state, consistently with its own interest and tranquillity, give “ establishment to more sects than one?†” For consistently with its interest and tranquillity, it should give *such* establishment to none.

Every sect should be *equally* supported, that is *equally* attached to the constitution of their country. That a favourite sect is chosen out from among others, and established with peculiar privileges,

\* Dr. Stock, p. 109.

† Ibid.

vileges, every one will allow, is no evidence of its superior merit. Because, as an endless variety has been established, these could not *all* be the best. Therefore, an establishment is a false standard to determine our judgment. This is the opinion of episcopals in Scotland; of Protestants in Roman Catholic countries, and of Dissenters every where. Had no particular sect been ever chosen out, and distinguished from the rest by government, but had all been equally countenanced and supported by it, then every sect would have been equally attached to the interest of the state. Constantine complained bitterly of the dire effects of his having supported one sect in preference to others, as tending to destroy the *tranquillity* and happiness of the empire. So that it must be the wisdom of every government to form the most entire and intimate union of all the different sects with *itself*, not by *uniformity* of religion, for that is a chimæra and impossible, but by adopting maxims more suited to the original principles of equity, by which harmony might be maintained among different parties, and all at length, laying aside their jealousies, might with equal zeal concur in advancing the general prosperity.\*

U

But,

\* L'unité de Religion n'est bonne que lorsqu' elle se trouve naturellement établie par la persuasion. Dès que la conviction cesse, un moyen de rendre aux Esprits la *tranquillité*, c'est de leur laisser la liberté. Lorsqu' elle est égale, pleine et entière, pour tous les Citoyens, elle ne peut jamais troubler la paix des familles. Rainal. Hist. Philos. & Polit. Tome vii. p. 340.

Quoiqu'ils ne soient pas membres de la même Eglise, ces sectaires s'aiment comme des enfans d'un seul & même pere. Ils ont vécu toujours en freres, parcequ'ils avoient la liberté de penser en hommes. Abbé Rainal. Tome vii. p. 21.



But, how is it that our author asks this question, whether the state can consistently “with its interest and tranquillity, give establishment to “more sects than one?”

Did he not know, that there are two established churches in Great Britain, and that the tranquillity of the state is greater since the Presbyterian church was established in Scotland? He might have known, also, that there are two established churches in England and Ireland, as Lord Mansfield had laid it down many years ago, in the House of Lords that the dissenters mode of worship is ESTABLISHED.

Note

35.

51.

These establishments in Great Britain are exceedingly different from each other, and the establishment of Protestant dissenters in Ireland is different from both, being placed on a much more liberal footing by the wisdom of George I. than the act of toleration in England, which shews the necessity, still more, of our opponents being explicit on the nature of ecclesiastical establishments.

The dissenting ministers in their address to King William for *establishing* a firm union of his Protestant subjects in matters of religion, express their desire and hope that this might be done, by making “the rule of christianity the rule of conformity.” We contend that no government has any right to lay down any other terms in the christian church; and that ministers of religion ought not to have any civil power, or political character.

The Bishop of Cloyne, in a preface to the London edition of his book, has gone into the argument

ment concerning religious establishments, so far as to assert the power of the legislature, in some sort of opposition to the judgment of the people. But, as he chooses to speak in an indefinite manner, without describing what he means by a religious establishment, and without assigning, what he thinks, the full extent of it, or offering clear and plain limitations, it is not easy to comprehend his meaning.

His argument is with Archdeacon Paley. They both maintain that religious establishments are necessary. But the archdeacon holds, that “ it is the *duty* of the magistrate, in the choice of the religion which he *establishe*s, to consult the faith of the nation rather than his own—and that it is an *equal chance*, which of two religions is more *true*, that of the magistrate, or that of the people.”

Upon which his Lordship observes; “ now to pass by the *strangeness* of the supposed axiom, that it is an *equal chance*, whether the *legislators*, or the *populace* of a country, are best qualified to form a sound judgment, which of two religions is *true*—to pass by the impossibility that the magistrate (the person, whose conduct is to be determined) can think it an equal chance whether the religion which he believes, or the religion which he disbelieves, is true—and of course the *strangeness* of the casuistry that it can be *his duty* to endow a class of men, for the purpose of teaching what in his conscience he thinks dangerous error, and of countenancing idolatry, or other practices, which (he is convinced) are forbidden by the supreme Being ;—the fair and immediate in-



"*ferences* from this doctrine are a sufficient confutation of it."\*

If we can collect his Lordship's meaning, and understand the principles he would advance in these *inferences*, they would seem to be, 1. That the legislators of every country have a right to establish such religion as they think best. 2. That legislators are better qualified to form a sound judgment of true religion than other men, or the *populace*, as his Lordship expresses it. And 3. That legislators may not endow a class of men to teach what they think are dangerous errors, or idolatry.

If I have been able to collect, and to give a fair representation of his opinion, I could have wished his Lordship had gone one step farther in laying down his *original principles* of ecclesiastical polity, and told us *how* the chief magistrate acquired the *authority* of establishing his own particular opinions, or any other religious opinions: and then, what was the extent of this authority. Whether he had a power to enforce his opinion, and was justified in using violence, or by what sort of sanctions his religious system was to be supported, whether of this world, or of a future world, or both. Some have used all the terrors of this world, imprisonment, various species of torture and of death, and have, also, consigned the unhappy sufferers to eternal punishment. Others would not go so far, but would justify *wholesome severities*, or would take away the confidence of government from those who would not accommodate themselves to the public standard, or would render them dishonourable, and incapable of serving their country. This

is

Note  
36.

\* Bishop of Cloyne, p. 15.

is to be done by test-acts, of which his Lordship is a zealous advocate.

Again it would seem, that this supreme authority in religion extends to all legislators indifferently; for his Lordship has made no limitation. Now it would be satisfactory to know, if this was the system he would support, or whether he would contend for any limitation. Such as for instance, that legislators might not establish idolatry, or the religion of Mahomet, or Confucius, but might establish christianity. And then, if this be a just limitation, whether he would contend for a farther limitation, that is, that legislators might only establish diocesan episcopacy and not presbytery.

If he should think proper to enter into a full examination of this subject, and illustrate it from history, the public would be enabled to judge what his principles were, and whether he could fairly support them. Should he maintain that every legislator possessed this supreme power in religion, then his Lordship would justify the Emperor Julian in establishing idolatry, and Mary of England for establishing popery. But he seems to except *idolatry*. And here we might ask, upon what principle does he limit the authority of government in the instance of idolatry?—Is it by his *private judgment* condemning it as wrong in itself?—so far we heartily agree with him. But this would overturn his principle, and would support the right of the people to judge; and this might be in opposition to the chief magistrate; many of whom have been found in different ages of the world, and are to be found now, who thought it *their duty* to endow a class of men to teach idolatry.

But



But perhaps, it is his Lordship's principle, that only such legislators have supreme ecclesiastical power, who condemn idolatry and dangerous error; and that it cannot be their duty to *endow* teachers of such error. But who is to be judge? Legislators or his Lordship? The people are out of the question; they are excluded.

Besides, this expression, *dangerous error*, is of great latitude and of great uncertainty; so that we know not what it means: whether it implies an error dangerous to the state, or dangerous to the persons that hold it, as affecting their future eternal happiness. And whether in both these cases, teachers who hold such dangerous error, ought not, in his Lordship's opinion, to be permitted to hold any church endowments. What I mean may be best illustrated by example.

Note  
37.

The episcopal clergy in Scotland were generally Jacobites, and therefore in the opinion of the chief magistrate, King William, maintained error dangerous to the state. Now, in his Lordship's language, it would be the *strangeness* of casuistry to suppose it was his *duty* to endow such a class of men for the purpose of teaching. And yet neither his Lordship, nor Dr. Stock, are advocates for taking away the endowments from the episcopal clergy in Scotland.\*

The episcopal clergy in Ireland generally, and very many in England, held the same *dangerous error* in the reigns of King William, and Queen Anne, and George I. Will his Lordship argue that they ought to have lost their endowments, and that it was the *duty* of our chief magistrates to

\* See Dr. Stock's representation of the case of Dr. Monro, p. 66 in the notes, &c.

to have conferred these on the Presbyterian ministers, who went universally into revolution principles, and succession of the house of Hanover.

Errors, reputed *dangerous* in a religious view, have been thought very different, and even opposite, in different parts and in different ages of the christian world, and therefore *all* legislators most certainly have not been “ qualified to form a sound judgment ” in religion, nor of consequence could they be *all* right in condemning what they called error. But, perhaps, his Lordship’s principles would lead him to maintain, that every chief magistrate had a right to determine in his own dominions. James I. who appears a great favourite with our opponents, did somewhat more : he extended his care to foreign states : he thought Vorstius should be burned in Holland for maintaining the Arminian doctrine, which he thought a dangerous error. The house of commons in the reign of Charles I. thought this doctrine dangerous both to the state and to religion : and yet the episcopal clergy that held this doctrine, did not lose their endowments ; they were promoted more than others. Every one knows at present, that they generally hold this doctrine in opposition to the doctrine established in the XXXIX. articles, and yet they neither lose their endowments, nor does this doctrine seem to be thought dangerous. Where then shall we look for the standard of dangerous error in the established church ? Not in the authority of our legislators, for that is rejected even by those who plead for it ; it is plainly then the opinion of the people, or of the endowed teachers in opposition to our legislators that endowed them.

Neither



Neither do our chief magistrates appear always to think that *variety* of religious opinion implies dangerous error. At the end of last century, England was set in a flame by a debate between South and Sherlock. One half of the kingdom condemned Sherlock for holding the doctrine, as he thought, of the Nicene Creed; the other half condemned South for holding, as he thought, the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, and each party thought the other maintained a dangerous error. The king, who alone had authority, by act of parliament, to determine, seemed to think neither of them dangerous, and put an end to the debate by his injunction.\* So each might enjoy his opinion in peace, and all was restored to tranquillity. And had legislators at all times acted with the like wisdom, we should have heard very little of dangerous error, which has been generally confined to some abstruse speculative opinion, beyond the comprehension of either of the contending parties, and only rendered *dangerous* by passion and violence, supported by the terrors of law, which have been directed much more frequently to the suppression of *truth* than of error.

Note  
38.

Not to enter into the question of the danger or innocency of error, it may be observed, that legislators are not exempted more than other men from the danger of embracing erroneous opinions, and should these be indeed dangerous, then to endow a class of men to teach them, would be contributing to support and spread error, and encrease the danger.

Note  
39.

Religion consists in the exercise of the noblest affections of the human soul. And can such an  
inward

\* In the year 1696, Feb. 2. Burnet's Hist. of his Times.

inward veneration of the divine character as shall dispose us to an imitation of God, be established by act of parliament, or an imperial edict?

Religion is a personal thing. It should be founded on conviction, and be the result of inquiry, and the use of our best understandings, in an impartial search after truth. But in this research, the wisest and the best men will fall into different opinions, as well as the vain and disputatious. And should legislators interpose their authority, how are they better qualified to ascertain the truth than other men? How often are they found much less qualified than men in the most humble station? Nor is this to be wondered at, since we are told that *integrity* is the best guide to religious truth.\* But still, should legislators promulgate their opinions under the sanction of law, this could not establish truth, because the human understanding can only submit to evidence; and establishments have thrown every difficulty and discouragement in the way of those who would search for truth. Let the established opinions be ever so absurd, if men are *bribed* to the profession of them by riches and honours, thousands will be forward in applying for these emoluments who will profess any thing, as we see in the different nations of the world, no matter how absurd or contradictory. Instead, therefore, of a security against error, this only lays a temptation to dissimulation and hypocrisy.

Note  
24

If the chief magistrate thinks himself entrusted with the support of true religion in his dominions, as the means of promoting the happiness of his subjects, he should consider himself under a

X

peculiar

\* John vii. 17.



peculiar obligation, by a becoming practice, by a god-like example of purity and virtue, to recommend it to his people. If this be not evident in him, and in those who call themselves *guardians* of religion, and are appointed by him, then it must be evident they have something else in view besides religion. We acknowledge that this was the case before the Reformation, when we think established error was established faith. We all think this is the case now in many nations of the earth. Are we sure that nothing of this kind has been admitted into our established church, and that it alone is exempt from error? But do we find any where a greater variety of opinion, and in more direct opposition to their established articles than in the *guardians* of this church?

In vain therefore have our legislators erected themselves into judges of dangerous opinion, or religious truth. It is their duty to form their own minds according to what they think is truth. And it is no less their duty to support their subjects in the most perfect use of their religious liberty. When they act otherwise, and encroach on the rights of private judgment, which they ought to hold sacred and inviolable, they should consider that they are particularly addressed, when it is said, *Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth.\** And that they are accountable to that awful tribunal where *the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the mighty men*, shall appear amidst the lowest of the people.†

It will be allowed, that all men should oppose *dangerous error*: but it should be considered whether

\* Rom. x. iv. 4. † Revelat. vi. 15.

whether this has been done more effectually by the reasonings of private men, or by political establishments. The cry of *dangerous error* has been raised as a bugbear by designing men upon a hundred occasions, when there was no error; just as the alarm has been sounded, that *the church was in danger*, when there was the most perfect security. And under this mask of religion, the most pernicious purposes have been concealed.

What is called dangerous error has too often been nothing more than the vain questions of a *vain philosophy*, and matter of doubtful disputation, that had no connection with religion.—— Church history would furnish no small catalogue of such curious fanciful notions, that have distracted the christian world at different periods.—— Perhaps it would not be difficult to point out some of them with which his Lordship is well acquainted, and to point out also a class of men, who are endowed to teach them. But as our subject does not directly lead to this, I would rather confine myself to his Lordship's system of ecclesiastical polity, and point it out as an *error* of very *dangerous* tendency, as instead of *uniting* subjects of the same great empire, it would break down their harmony, would support faction and party spirit, and would defend unequal and unjust laws that lead to oppression and tyranny.\*

*Note*  
38.

But, in his opinion, the most salutary effects have been derived from the chief magistrate establishing his own opinions, in opposition to that of the people. For he adds, "Were it," that is the archdeacon's doctrine, "to be admitted,

X 2

"Constantine

\* "All molestation, great or little, direct or indirect, for the sake of religion, is a true tyranny." Barbeyrac's Hist. of Morality, p. 69.



“ Constantine and all other christian princes  
 “ must have infringed *their duty* in establishing  
 “ christianity; all Protestant states in establishing  
 “ the Reformation.”\*

I mean not to enter into any defence of the learned archdeacon's opinion, but to examine his Lordship's principles in his reasoning upon it, so far as we are able to collect them. I would observe then, that he seems plainly to maintain that the *purity* of religion was either derived from, or supported by the interference of civil government, and was the consequence of ecclesiastical establishments. Whilst the reverse, I apprehend, will almost invariably be found to be the truth.

For, in opposition to the strong *assertions* of his Lordship, which he has not attempted to support by historical facts, which alone can determine, it may be observed, that the authority of the New Testament is every where against him. It no where supposes that the chief magistrate has any right to establish his opinions, but maintains the rights of conscience as sacred, and therefore that we must *obey God rather than man*. It represents religion to depend on personal persuasion; and therefore recommends examination, and the careful exercise of private judgment.† Upon these principles, christianity supported itself during several ages in opposition to every established religion in the world. And legislators were at length induced to embrace the truth by the influence of private persons. But, as soon as civil authority interfered, and legislators intermeddled in a province that did not belong  
 to

\* Bishop of Cloyne p. 16.

† Acts xvii. 11. Rom. xiv. 5. I. Corinth. ii. 5. Gal. v. 1. I. John iv. 1. Mat. xx. 25.

to them, and established their *own* opinions, and *endowed* a class of men to teach them as the standard of truth, instead of the holy Scriptures, the purity of the christian faith was destroyed, and the peace of the christian world was at an end. These fatal effects were quickly felt, even in the days of Constantine. This was already laid before his Lordship, and though he has not controverted the *fact*, yet he again appeals to that period, without adducing any proof. The early historians and fathers of the church also take notice of it.\* So that *at all times* the purity of religion was only supported by private persons, in opposition to establishments. And after the world had been long covered with darkness, the Reformation was brought about, in opposition to sovereign princes and legislators, by the learning, the virtue, and undaunted resolution of private men.

Luther, at first, was not supported, nor even countenanced by his sovereign,† for it was not through the influence of government that the  
Reformation

\* πλεονα ημιν της ειρηνης ο πολεμος ποιζει την ωφελειαν.  
Theod. Hist. Eccl. p. 248. Sozomen. Hist. Eccl. p. 599.  
Morte martyrum religio defensa, cumulata fides, ecclesia roborata est. Ambrosius de fide Resur. p. 29.

† Tantum abest, ut ab aulicis subornatus, aut incitatus sit —ut doluerit etiam illustrissimus princeps, dux Saxoniae, Fridericus Elector imperii, moveri certamina, longè prospiciens, quanquam exordium esset de re plausibili, tamen paulatim latius vagaturum esse hanc flammam.

In hac mutatione, præcipue consilium Dei omnipotentis consideremus, qui ecclesiam non autoritate, potentia, aut sapientia humana, sed ex ore infantium, ac lactentium, ministerio verbi sui, quod est potentia Dei ad salutem omnium credenti, colligit, condit, ac regit. Nec armis, aut præsiigiis regum, sed umbraculo alarum suarum, protegit, servat, ac tuetur, ut plantet cælos. Puceri Chronicon. l. v. p. 954, 957.



Reformation took its rise; but it was the influence of government that prevented its arriving to its just perfection, in almost every country of Europe. So that established systems, instead of supporting christianity, have had a pernicious tendency from their first institution. And whoever will be at the pains of examining the early historians in their account of the council of Nice, which is commonly referred to as laying the foundation of religious establishments, will find that it had its origin in ambitious disputation, not in a zeal for religion—that Constantine highly disapproved their contentions, and reprimanded the contending parties with severity.\* But when he changed his mind, and convened the council, they will find, that it was conducted by passion, by anger and *ignorance*: for the historians expressly tell us, that the bishops did not understand what they had transacted and decreed, and give us the most lively picture of their confusion and perplexity.† And to conclude the scene, they will find, that this council, so much revered, ended

\* See the Emperor's letter in Euseb. de vita Constantini. Socrat. Eccl. Hist. p. 15.

† Socratis Hist. Eccl. l. i. c. 23. Sozomen. Hist. Eccl. l. ii. c. 18. These passages give a very different account from what we find in Socrates, l. i. c. 9. The learned reader will be at no loss in judging how far the charge brought against the bishops of this council is well founded, by comparing these passages together, and considering the effects this council produced. He may also be referred to Socrates, l. iii. c. 7. Theodorit. Hist. Eccl. p. 39, 97, 102, 113. Philostorgii Hist. Eccl. a Photio, p. 469.

A writer in examining this debate, has spoken of the ancient ecclesiastical historians, whom I have adduced to the character of St. Athanasius, with the same discernment, as if he should call Baronius a Lutheran, Du Pin a Calvinist, or Clarendon a republican, and yet this worthy person thought himself qualified to write what he calls a CRITICAL REVIEW.—He appears to be just as well acquainted with the Scottish historians. See his pamphlet, p. 71.

ended in persecution—such was the foundation of ecclesiastical power, which was carried forward to its perfection in the domination of the papal hierarchy.

But, should it be contended, that legislators ought to establish their own religious opinions in preference to those of their people; it may be observed, that this is commonly attended with much difficulty, and sometimes with danger. Let us suppose *a class of men endowed* to teach such opinions.—How will these established teachers instruct a people that will not attend their instructions? they cannot be compelled; or if they could be compelled by military force and terror of death, this is not the means of conviction. What, at first, was only difference of opinion, innocent perhaps and harmless, is turned into aversion, and their minds become embittered against men whom they must consider under the odious character of persecutors armed with terror, not as ministers of religion that should speak peace and good-will to mankind.

It is evident that religious truth cannot be maintained in this manner; it can only be promoted by argument and such persuasion as is dictated by kindness. The rights of conscience are sacred and inviolable, and are of the number of those *natural* rights that are not to be *alienated* without a crime.\* Therefore to contend that legislators may establish a national religion, is asserting a right in the supreme magistrate to make

\* “ I have long looked on liberty of conscience as one of the rights of human nature antecedent to society, which no man could give up, *because it was not in his own power.*” Burnet’s Hist. vol. ii. p. 216.



make a law without a correspondent obligation in the subject to obey—it is setting the most sacred rights of men, their duty to God, at variance with the laws of the land.

If peace and harmony is desirable in a nation, this can only be effected in one of two ways. Either by granting to different sects a full and entire liberty, or by exterminating all but the favourite sect. The former was adopted by Poland towards the beginning of the Reformation, and is now by the states of America. The latter was the policy of Spain, which laid waste her fairest provinces, where silence and desolation still prevails. The like evil effects, though not in an equal degree, were experienced in France, by her persecution of the Protestants after the revocation of the edict of Nantez. And both these kingdoms lost their most useful and industrious subjects.

So that this principle of his Lordship would support an institution, either useless, or the most pernicious and destructive that can be imagined.

But history does not shew us, that legislators have always thought it their duty to adopt this principle; but on the contrary, shews us, that the chief magistrate has sometimes established or supported different religious sects, at the same time: and sometimes has renounced his own, and embraced that of the people. And yet this, I believe, is what his Lordship calls the *strangeness of casuistry*.

Sigismund, we have seen, established three different sects in Poland. And Henry of Anjou, when

when he was elected to that throne, though a bigotted Roman Catholic, and did it with reluctance, yet was obliged to maintain this establishment, and to take an oath to support it, as a necessary condition of his being crowned.\* The kings of Prussia are Presbyterian, and they support the Lutheran church; the present Empress of Russia was educated a Lutheran, being a German princess, but renounced her religion, and was re-baptised according to the rites of the Greek church, and embraced and supported the religion of the people. The late emperor, her consort, was also bred in the Lutheran church, and he also embraced the Greek religion, which was the religion of the *populace*, with a view of succeeding to the throne; but he was no sooner in secure possession of it, than he thought himself freed from the necessity of dissimulation, and went roundly to work to introduce his own religion. He ordered many painted images of saints to be removed from the churches; and displayed his public contempt of many rites and ceremonies, regarded by his subjects with the most profound reverence. But this attempt of his to pull down images succeeded no better with him than the attempt of James II. of England to set up images. They were both dethroned, and the emperor lost his life, and this was one great cause of it: as the opposite policy was one great cause of the empress's success in dethroning her husband, and establishing herself on the throne.†

Y

Gustavus

\* Henry objected, and tried to withhold his consent: upon which one of the Polish envoys cried out, "unless your majesty confirms this article, you cannot be king of Poland." *Nisi eam conditionem approbaveris, Rex Poloniae non eris.* Pac. Con. Aug. iii. p. 19. cited by Coxe. Travels into Poland, vol. i. p. 25.

† Coxe's Travels into Russia, vol. ii. p. 215, 216.



Gustavus Vasa was able to overturn the established church of Sweden, and to introduce and support the Protestant religion, which he had embraced.\*

Henry IV. could not thus support his own religion in France, but thought it prudent to renounce the Protestant religion, and embrace the religion of the most numerous sect, to secure him in his throne. King William, and the princes of the house of Hanover embraced the religion of the church of England, at their accession to the throne of these realms; which was not their own, but the religion of the people.

From these instances we see, that chief magistrates do not *always* think it their duty to act upon the principles of his Lordship, but when policy directs can assume those of the learned archdeacon: and that they do not *always* think that the religion of the *populace* though different from their own, may not be maintained, although there is reason to believe that sometimes they have thought it contained "dangerous error, "and countenanced idolatry;" and at other times, there is no reason to suppose, they judged so unfavourably of the popular religion.

In support, however, of the magistrate's authority, his Lordship asks; "what chance would "there have been of the conversion of a pagan (except in a few instances amongst philosophers) from any errors, however gross, "which the magistrate had sanctioned, and retained a number of learned men to support;

" when

\* Vertot's Revolutions of Sweden.

“ when there were no persons authorised to detect them, and teach the truth ?”

How is it that his Lordship don't see, that this is a two-edged weapon, that may be as effectually employed to support established error, as truth. And still more, when in this very passage, where, urging the utility of the magistrate's interference, he supposes that “ he had sanctioned gross errors, and retained a number of learned men to support them.” How shall the magistrate be induced to alter such erroneous system, and who is it, in this case, that will *authorise* persons to detect error, and “ teach the truth ?” The magistrate will not : the people cannot ; so upon this principle, the world is forever to be chained down in error, if the magistrate has once sanctioned it, and chooses to continue this sanction.

But could not his Lordship have recollected, that during the first ages of christianity, many pagans were converted from “ gross errors, which “ the magistrate had sanctioned”——though “ there were no persons *authorised*,” (in his sense) “ to detect them, and teach the truth.” And what evidence is there to induce him to think, that this should be “ in few instances, except “ amongst philosophers ?”

The number of philosophers that were converted to christianity, bore no proportion to the amazing numbers of other men, of every other description, that embraced it. Besides, some of these were the very men that were “ retained to support the gross errors which the

Y 2

“ magistrate



“magistrate had sanctioned.” And could his Lordship suspect that men who were retained to support the established system, would betray their trust?

Besides, the simplicity and purity of the christian institution did not suit their taste, nor was it on this ground that our divine religion was to stand.\*—Philosophic pride was as obstinate, as what has been called spiritual pride. They are of the same origin, flowing from human vanity, and under different names, are commonly productive of the like effects, and chiefly of an obstinate attachment to their particular sect. Hence the philosophers of ancient times were enemies to christianity. *Some* of them, indeed, as the *Free-thinkers* of modern times, were averse from the established religion, and others indulged themselves in the wildness of enthusiasm. Some of them, no doubt, embraced christianity; and retaining a fondness for many fanciful opinions taught in their colleges, endeavoured to incorporate these with the doctrines of revelation, in which they succeeded but too well, and thereby gave rise to that abstruse, dark system, known in after ages by the name of *scholastic divinity*, which destroyed the purity of the christian doctrine, and for many centuries was zealously supported, even, in preference to holy Scripture, and in many places, is still held in the highest veneration.

Amongst the most ingenious and learned of those philosophic fathers of the church, Justin Martyr is placed in a very high rank. But his philosophy taught him to consider revelation as a republication of the divine law, originally im-

planted

\* 1. Cor. i. 26, 27.

planted in the heart of man, and that all those who lived according to the dictates of this divine law, were to be accounted christians, and should be rewarded according to their works. In this number he mentions Socrates and Heraclitus among the Greeks, along with Abraham, Elias and others among the Jews.\* This opinion appears to have been received down to the fourth century; for Eusebius says, that the christian religion is the same with that of Abraham, acknowledging one God over all, and serving him by works of virtue.† From such doctrines, we may suppose, it was, that the Emperor Constantine, who was an admired preacher, and never wanted crowded audiences, thought he gave an exalted idea of christianity, when he taught that it was “as old as the beauty of the works of God.”‡—These fathers thought they were countenanced in these opinions by the authority of an apostle, who says, “*of truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.*”§

But we may see the utility of modern legislators interposing to correct such “dangerous error,” and “endowing a class of men for the purpose of teaching,” that “they are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved

\* Οἱ μετα λόγῳ βιωσαντες, χριστιανοὶ εἰσι, καὶ ἄθεοι ἐνομισθησαν ὅτιον ἐν Ἑλλήσιν μὲν Σωκράτης καὶ Ἡρακλεῖτος, καὶ οἱ ὁμοιοὶ αὐτοῖς ἐν βαρβάροις δὲ Ἀβραάμ. κ. τ. λ. Justin Martyr Apol. ii. p. 82. 83.

† Ἐνα ἐπὶ πάντων ἐμολογήσας Θεὸν καὶ αὐτὸν ἐργοῖς ἀρετῆς—θεραπεύσας. Eusebii. Hist. Eccl. p. 16, 17.

‡ Euseb. de vita Constantini. p. 469. Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester, is full of indignation at this notion. Discourse on the Spirit. 2d part, p. 126.

§ Acts x. 34, 35.



“ saved by the law or sect which he professeth, so  
 “ that he be diligent to frame his life, accord-  
 “ ing to that law, and the light of nature. For  
 “ holy scripture doth set out unto us only  
 “ the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must  
 “ be saved.”\* And the clauses in the Atha-  
 nasian creed, usually called the *damnatory* clauses,  
 furnish a powerful antidote against other opinions  
 held by Justin Martyr,† and those early philo-  
 sophers, and christian fathers that thought with  
 him.

Though these are such striking proofs of the  
 wisdom and importance of ecclesiastical establish-  
 ments on his Lordship's principles, yet it is ma-  
 terial to observe, that none of these *original*  
 principles adduced here, convey to us the least  
 idea of a *natural* and *essential* union of any one  
 particular form of church polity with any civil  
 government whatever. Rather, on the contrary,  
 they seem plainly to shew, that they are in-  
 different and variable, and may be changed ac-  
 cording to the judgment, or caprice of legisla-  
 tors, when they are able to bring about such a  
 change; which, however, history shews us is very  
 far from being always in their power; or if it  
 were would not always be for the advancement of  
 truth.

3. But, his Lordship's apologist asks, “ Does  
 “ any church in principles, government, and  
 “ practice, appear to be *more adapted* to the  
 “ genius of the British monarchy, or to the  
 “ temper and habits of the people, than the  
 “ church already established?”‡

If

\* XXXIX Articles.

† Dial. cum Tryphone, p. 313, 357 283.

‡ Dr. Stock, p. 109.

If by the church already established, be meant prelacy, I will answer on the authority of the best and wisest parliament that ever sat in England, that it is so far from being "adapted to the genius of the British monarchy," that it is subversive of it.\* It may, also, be observed, that to speak of the established church being only *more adapted* to the British monarchy than any other, is giving up the notion of an *essential* union, which his patron contends for; and here again, we find him deserting his Lordship. Besides, he has not laid before us any account of the principles and government of this church, and therefore has not furnished his readers with materials to answer his questions.

The Doctor has told us, that "the object of his historical excursion has been to collect materials for answering these interesting questions, the last particularly."

But this circumstance, it seems, he has forgotten. He has accumulated abundance of materials, such as they are, but he has not told us how they are to be applied in "answering any of these interesting questions, and the last particularly." So that every one is left to apply them as he thinks best. And this application being according to every one's judgment, may probably be very different from the opinion of our learned author. The only conclusion he seems to draw, is, what immediately follows, and would seem to be an apology for his invective against the church of Scotland—"If in the course of my search I have been obliged to look in to the features of a neighbour church with an inquisitiveness that carries the appearance  
" of

\* Preamble to the act for abolishing episcopacy.



" of *ill-nature*, I hope to stand acquitted from  
 " such a charge, on the unexceptionable plea of  
 " necessity."\*

This, every one will see, is not applying his collection of materials in answering the interesting questions, which he says, was the object of it—there, however, he leaves us, and goes on to another subject.

Besides, it is not easy to discern the necessity of " *ill-nature*, or the appearance of it," in examining the features of a neighbour church, at so remote a period, and especially a church to which he and his brethren ought to think themselves under the highest obligations. For had it not been for this church, and those connected with her in England and Ireland, our civil constitution had been changed into tyranny, and his established church had gone back to Rome.

When he speaks of *ill-nature*, and dipping his pen in gall, he should have considered, that this was altogether immaterial; that it was perfectly *harmless*, if not unbecoming, and as his patron has said, " can ultimately be injurious only to  
 " the persons who employ, and the cause which  
 " can be supposed to want it."†—We looked for strength of argument, supported by an exact and comprehensive knowledge of history, and an accurate knowledge, also, of the British constitution. Thank Providence, we live not under the reigns of Charles, or of James, when high-churchmen could do a great deal more than dip their pens in gall, and when the effects of their wrath were dreadful. The wisdom and mildness of our government, under the auspicious reign of

Note

34.

\* Dr. Stock, p. 109, 110. † Bishop of Cloyne, p. 11.

of the house of Hanover, has taken away this cup of bitterness. Moderate churchmen, assisted by Protestant dissenters, placed this illustrious family on the throne, in opposition to all the dark machinations of high church-men, and by the divine blessing, they will support them on the throne, in opposition to their machinations, at what time soever they may think they have "a safe opportunity" of attempting to bring back their favourite family. They have already made two attempts, which have been defeated: and we trust, that all their attempts, whether open or concealed, will end in the like disappointment and confusion.

But, to answer the above interesting questions, instead of "looking into the features of a neighbour church with an appearance of ill-nature," it would have been more useful to have examined his own, and to have answered, if he could, the heavy charges brought against her *political* character, supported not by the censures of her adversaries, but by the judgment of members of her own communion of the highest authority. But tacitly to acquiesce in the justness of all these severe censures, and with all her infirmities about her, and they are not a few, to boast still of her *political* importance, is placing oneself in a point of view the most humiliating to which a man of letters can be reduced.

It is contended, and to this we have adduced proof, that the genius of prelacy tends to the advancement of arbitrary power. A certain implicit submission, which is exacted in this church, it is alleged, prepares and breaks the mind for political servitude. We call upon our learned antagonist to bring the judgment of political men



Note  
40.

in favour of his principles, when he chooses clearly to explain them. The authorities he has hitherto adduced, are no better than the opinion of some ecclesiastics in their own cause—high-churchmen, of no acknowledged political abilities—of the most exceptionable character—some of whom he himself seems almost ashamed of. For he not only calls Heylin an *adversary*, but says, “his testimony should be received with “caution;” and yet he adduces his testimony. He might have known that the testimony of Primate Bramhal was equally suspicious and improper.\* For this man, when Bishop of Derry, was impeached of high-treason in the parliament of Ireland, in March 1640, by Captain Mervin. The charge brought against him and others of Strafford’s creatures, was for subverting the laws, and introducing arbitrary government—inflicting infamous punishments on persons of reputation, and subverting the rights of parliament. But a dispute being raised, whether the House of Lords in Ireland had power of judicature in capital crimes, the prosecution was dropped here, and carried to England the following year, by a committee of both houses of the Irish parliament, “who carried up impeachments against Bramhal “and others, all of them creatures of Strafford, “and the tools of his tyranny.”† And yet our author, without hesitation, adduces the authority of such a man, in aid of high-church politics, as the best support of our civil liberties, and of the British constitution! The

\* The ill temper and violence of Bramhal, is strongly marked by his conduct at a public conference between the Bishop of Down and the Presbyterian ministers, in the year 1636. Hamilton who managed the debate by appointment of his brethren, was member of the convocation in 1634. MS. in my possession.

† Rushworth’s Coll. vol. i. Mrs. Macaulay’s History of England, vol. ii. p. 422.

Wood, in *Athenæ Oxon.* c. 183, 184. says “as to his historical merits in some things, Heylyn was too much a party to be an Historian. “In 1660, upon his Majesty’s return to his kingdoms, he was restored, but never rose higher than Subdean of Westminster.”

The feeble opinion of such writers, dictated not by wisdom, but by faction, anger, and the worst passions of the human heart, is set up in opposition not only to the solemn judgment of an English parliament, but what with some men will weigh more, in opposition to men of the highest character who joined Charles I. in the civil war, and were members of his parliament at Oxford.

How must we pity our learned opponent for being led away by bigotry, I hope, not his own, but of such men, whose principles, we might expect he would have treated with contempt, or at least with that generous neglect they deserve.

It is not enough to adduce party writers of factious and violent temper, to abuse and insult those that differ from them—it is not from deistical or high-church writers, that the candid and liberal will form their judgment of the Independents in England, or the Presbyterians in Scotland or Ireland. Delicacy should have prevented Dr. Stock from appealing to such authorities. And I must own, I would have been ashamed to have adduced the censures of Presbyterians heated with contention against the episcopal hierarchy, though it would have been easy to have crowded my pages with the bitterness of complaint, to which they were too often driven by the violence of persecution. I know not whether I may be excused for giving *one* instance, in a note,\* though

Z 2

not

\* Episcopatus, ergo, Anglicanus nec est divinus, quem II  
Apostoli instituerunt; nec humanus quem veteres in- II  
vexerunt: sed Satanicus, quem antichristus adultus, filius  
perditionis, Satanae organon nequissimum, & antichristi  
affectae evexerunt, in perniciem ecclesiae, & ad vastitatem

which was a wonder to many & a great discontent to him & his  
the reason being manifest to those that well knew the temper of  
son. I shall forbear to make mention of that matter any farther  
He takes notice, however, of his forwardness, high conceit of himself  
confidence — that by some he was accounted too high & proud for  
And not with the ill-natured reflect



not in English, and whether it may not be imputed to me as a want of moderation by the learned Doctor, though his own book is filled with such quotations of our adversaries, which he has heaped up with unwearied diligence.

Note  
41.

However, in all his inquiries into ecclesiastical polity, we are still at a loss to know what are his principles. It would seem as we have already observed, that he had not formed any certain opinion on the subject. At one time, he would advance the ecclesiastical establishment, whatever it is, to the dignity of forming a part of what he calls the *entire* constitution, in conformity with the Bishop of Cloyne, who would raise it to a level with the other powers of the state under the crown, if we can judge by the sound of words, where he speaks of *two cones*,\* which we don't understand, and therefore asked an explanation, but this Dr. Stock has not attempted—he would rather seem, afterwards, to condemn that notion, where he says, “neither the Scots nor “their own divines could ever prevail on the “wise parliament of England to commit to “church assemblies a coercive power, not subject to the controul of the civil magistrate.” But, again, he says, “that churchmen of all “denominations have been apt to make an ill “use

nineæ Dominicæ. Altare Damascenum, c. v. p. 223. Dr. Stock at least, will not think lightly of this quotation from a book, which King James I. thought so highly of, as to deem it unanswerable; for the Doctor has assured us, he was *no fool*.

\* What the Bishop of Cloyne calls a *double cone*, others have called a “*threefold chimæra*, a monster to the law of “the land, and a Cerberus to the religion.” Sir Edward Deering's speech in parliament, in 1640. Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 100. Mrs. Macaulay's History of England, vol. ii. p. 384. Let it be observed, that Deering was an episcopal.

ch a man can our learned Dr stoop to entertain his Readers. But he considered, whether they might not think this unpardonable in an work, professedly intended for general information, which ought to be with a sedate, disinterested, & unbiassed mind. Nor is it enough to assume that Character even to

" use of power, when trusted with *too much* of it."\* So that he would grant them some, though not "too much;" but what, or how much, or under what "controul of the civil magistrate," he has not attempted to define: so that amidst all this ambiguity, we are left in the dark, and amused with general, uncertain words, that convey to us no information.

" To argue against the hierarchy, by counting " the mischiefs, which the English constitution " has sometimes experienced from its incorpora- " tion with it, is the old sophism of denying " the use of a thing from its abuse."†

Here the Doctor acknowledges, that *mischiefs* have been experienced by the English constitution from the incorporation of the hierarchy—but where are the *advantages*—what are those " be- " nefits which have been observed to result from " it, and which in the judgment of the soberer " part of the nation, have outweighed its de- " fects."‡ Why are not these benefits pointed out? Why are our opponents so fond of *assertions*, and so very reserved in offering proof? It is contended, that no such benefits have ever resulted from it. Its constitution is suited to arbitrary—power—and it has been shewn by historical deduction that its uniform operation has been suited to its constitution. The veneration that ecclesiastics had paid to the church of Rome was transferred to the head of this church, and produced the like implicit submission to the crown in political matters, as it had to the popes of Rome in matters ecclesiastical. This kept up that ecclesiastical servitude, and resignation of private

\* Dr. Stock, p. 60, 107. † Ibid. p. 108. ‡ Ibid.

faithful recorder of such facts as occur to him: he should be a  
enter into the views & designs of the Actors he brings on the stage: he  
the part of a Critick; be exact in the choice of his Authors; sever  
mining the materials with which they furnish him; & judicious in  
It is intended that a writer should be a



private judgment, which is so favourable to civil tyranny. This state of church government in England, introduced at the Reformation, strengthened the tyranny of the crown, by flinging into the scale of regal power that absolute and unlimited jurisdiction, which had been wrested from the bishop of Rome.\*

As so many members of the established church are men of the most liberal and generous principles, I trust they will consider in its just light what I have said, or am about to say, concerning the political influence of the hierarchy.—They have risen superior to its benumbing power, and have escaped the taint of it:—they have rendered the noblest services to their country. Presbyterians, at different periods, have received their generous protection, which I am happy in having an opportunity of acknowledging.—As it is our honour to be embarked in the same public cause, they will do me the justice to think, that I always keep in view the distinction that should ever be made between men whom I consider as the zealous friends of the constitution, and others of the same church, whose character history points out to us as altogether the reverse.

To these latter no apology is necessary: they will not complain that we impute principles to the hierarchy which it disclaims; for every one acquainted with the history of this church, knows that principles of slavery and arbitrary power were the boast and glory of the hierarchy, which they assert as peculiarly their own, and claim as their

*Note*  
42.

\* Mrs. Macaulay's History of England, vol. i. p. 251.  
—vol. iii. p. 53, 54, 259. Hume. Vol. viii. p. 204.

*is in danger of leading himself & others perpetually astray.*

their *distinguished honour*. The canons transmitted to Scotland in 1635, exalted the royal authority as absolute and uncontroulable, and were received by "that nation with great inward apprehension and discontent. They saw these speculative principles reduced to practice, and a whole body of ecclesiastical laws established without any previous consent either of church or state. They dreaded, lest by a parity of reason, like arbitrary authority from like pretences and principles, would be assumed in civil matters. They remarked, that the delicate boundaries, which separate church and state, were already passed, and many *civil* ordinances established by the canons, under colour of ecclesiastical institutions.\*"

It was not particular churchmen that held these slavish principles, but the whole body of the clergy. Their representatives in both convocations of Canterbury and York, in 1640, declared themselves of this opinion. And afterwards the clergy were required to subscribe this doctrine; and we find them triumphing in it as a *glory* peculiar to, and appropriated to themselves. As these doctrines had produced the most fatal effects in England, we need not wonder at the declaration of parliament in 1642, that they intended to take away the government by bishops, evidently mischievous to the church and state.†

*Note*  
42.

The conduct of the bishops in Ireland could not tend to give a more favourable opinion of the order; for we are told, that the whole bench  
of

\* Hume's History of England, vol vi. p. 270.

† Rushworth, vol. iii. p. 378.



of Irish bishops vindicated the tyranny of Strafford's administration in this kingdom.\*

Note  
43.

Episcopacy was restored triumphant with Charles II. and in her train came in the doctrine of *passive obedience* and *non-resistance*, marked with as great fury and madness as ever. By the act of uniformity, says Mr. Locke on this subject, all the clergy of England are obliged to subscribe and declare the corporation oath; viz. that it is not lawful, upon any pretence whatsoever, to take arms against the king.† The spirit of this hierarchy is not only unfriendly to liberty by throwing discouragements in the way of freedom of enquiry,‡ but by habituating the mind early to a slavish dependence on ecclesiastical authority, and to look up with awe to spiritual superiors, in a long gradation. Hence, not only those characters that are distinguished by want of fortitude, or a total indifference about these things, are apt to be warped by the weight of this hierarchy, but churchmen who have appeared forward and resolute, and upon occasion have been eminent defenders of liberty and the rights of mankind, have not been able to act consistently, nor divest themselves of its baneful influence. Every one knows the amiable character of Tillotson, and the resolute character of Burnet, and yet towards the end of Charles II. reign, Tillotson became so pliant, and so thoroughly accommodating to the fashionable doctrines of the church, as to use all his eloquence, assisted by Burnet, to persuade Lord Russell, when

\* Carte's Life of Ormond, vol. i. p. 121.

† See a pamphlet entitled, Difficulties and Discouragements, which attend the study of the Scriptures, in the way of private judgment; written by one who was raised to the right rev. bench in England.

‡ The Declaration enjoined by Stat. 14. Car. 2. c. 4. was altered in 1682. And by Stat. 1 N. & M. Sess. 1. c. 8. that part is rejected, which says, "it is not lawful upon

when in prison, to avow those slavish principles, suggesting that this might make *atonement*, and save his life. To which he answered, " he could not say a LIE—I can have no conception of a limited monarchy which has not a right to defend its own limitations: my conscience will not permit me to say otherwise to the king."

But Tillotson pursued the matter to the last; and on the day before that illustrious nobleman suffered death, wrote to him in favour of passive obedience and non-resistance, taking him at such disadvantage, to engage him to retract his opinion, and in these awful moments, practising upon every tender feeling of the human heart.—Happily for the cause of liberty without effect: for it could not be wrested from his Lordship at death, to bequeath a legacy of slavery to his country.\*

This transaction is not more remarkable, than it is to observe, that it seems to have cost little to these eminent divines, Tillotson and Burnet, to change sides again, and with the greatest readiness to go into the Revolution.

Should it be alleged, that these divines were influenced, in some measure, by the hope of saving the life of Lord Russel, we might adduce another remarkable instance, very similar, where there could be no hope of pardon.

A a

The

\* See Mr. Samuel Johnston in answer to Tillotson; Lady Russel's Letters, No. 104 and 111, written after the Revolution, when she had a fair occasion to remind the good Doctor of his old principles, though this is done with much gentleness.

any pretence whatsoever, to take up Arms against the King; &c. Watson's Clergy-Man's Law; or, the Complete Incumbent. p. 108.



The Duke of Monmouth was attended by the Bishop of Ely, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, Dr. Tennison, and Dr. Hooper, as his assistants to prepare him for death. And we are told, that even on the scaffold, he was closely pressed to acknowledge the doctrine of *non-resistance in particular*: which he would not; alleging, that he acknowledged the doctrine of the church of England in general, in the communion of which he lived and died. The assistants replied, *that since he professed himself to be of the church, he ought to acknowledge in particular the doctrine of non-resistance*. The duke said, that the *general* acknowledgment of the church of England's doctrine included all—and a great deal more to the same purpose. Afterwards he joined with them in prayer, though the assistants said, they could not *pray so heartily* as if he had owned that doctrine so often pressed upon him.\*

Such was the conduct of these ecclesiastics, amidst all the madness and tyranny of the reign of James II. And such principles did they hold so essential to their church, that, it seems, their devotion was affected by the refusal to acknowledge them!

It is worthy of notice, that the two assisting bishops were among the seven, who soon after resisted their king, and were sent to the Tower for their resistance. And Tennison could go into the principles of the Revolution, and had no scruple to accept the see of Canterbury from King William. But the Bishop of Ely *resisted* the new government, and his principles of *non-resistance* could allow him to enter into a conspiracy to dethrone King William, and restore the abdicated

\* Life of King James, p. 112.

abdicated prince.\* What are we to think of all this inconsistency of conduct and principle in these men? Are we to think they contributed nothing to the arbitrary and tyrannical government of King James? And are these the men pointed out to the nation as pillars of the state, and *essential* to the support of civil liberty?

The universities of Oxford and Cambridge held the same slavish principles, and taught them as the doctrines of the established church. The heads of the colleges are generally ecclesiastics. It is observed of them in the inauspicious reign of Charles I. that, "to the disgrace of science and academic breeding, they had ever been the servile tools of the court."† The famous act, or decree of the university of Oxford, passed in 1683, affirms in the name of the holy Trinity, that we ought not to defend our lives and estates, our *religion* or our laws, against illegal and arbitrary power. That our obedience must be clear, absolute, and without exception of any persons or states, or order of men, though the king should subvert the government, destroy our constitution, or become a *tyrant*.

In their address to King James, in 1684, they declare they could never swerve from the principles of their institution, and their *religion by law established in the church of England*, which indispensably bound them to bear all faith and true obedience to their sovereign, *without any restrictions and limitations*.‡ Thus complimenting away every principle of British liberty; and shewing at the same time how ill qualified they

A a 2

were

\* Burnet's Hist. of his Times, vol. ii. p. 40.

† Mrs. Macaulay's Hist. of Eng. vol. iii. p. 361.

‡ Sir J. Dalrymple's Memoirs, p. 61.



were to instil principles of generosity and magnanimity into the breasts of the illustrious youth committed to their care, and how ill they deserved the sacred trust of an exclusive right of education.

We may adduce to this purpose the authority of a prelate of this church, who thus confirms our observation. “ The universities, Oxford  
 “ especially, have been very unhappily successful in *corrupting* the principles of those, who  
 “ were sent to be bred among them : so that few  
 “ of them escaped the taint of it. And the generality of the CLERGY were not only ill-principled, but ill-tempered. They exclaimed  
 “ against all *moderation* as endangering the church,  
 “ though it is visible the church is in no sort of  
 “ danger, from either the numbers, or the interest that dissenters have among us, which by  
 “ reason of the toleration are now so quieted,  
 “ that nothing can keep up any heat in those  
 “ matters, but the folly and bad humour that  
 “ the clergy are possessed with, and which they  
 “ infuse into all those with whom they have credit.  
 “ But at the same time, though the great and visible danger that hangs over us, is from *Popery*,  
 “ which a miscarriage in the present war must  
 “ let in upon us, with an inundation, not to be  
 “ either resisted or recovered, they seem to be  
 “ blind on that side, and to apprehend and fear  
 “ nothing from that quarter.”\*

“ In those seats of education, the same prelate observes, instead of being formed to love  
 “ their country and constitution, and the laws  
 “ and liberties of it, they are rather disposed to  
 “ love

\* Burnet's Hist. ann. 1704.

"love *arbitrary* government, and to become  
 " *slaves* to absolute monarchy."\*

From this view of the constitution and principles of the established hierarchy, we are better enabled to give an answer to Dr. Stock's third inquiry, whether the principles, government, and practice of the established church—be adapted to the genius of the British monarchy. And it is evident, they are so entirely the reverse, that nothing can be more opposite to the genius of a free people. They would not be received in certain despotic states, for there, we are told, the influence of religion controuls the excesses of despotism,† but here religion is made subservient to the purposes of tyranny,

In the contest with King James II. need it be asked, whether the constitution was saved by virtue of these principles of the established church, or by deserting them? Not only Protestant dissenters, but many illustrious members of this church, saw through the designs and craft of the clergy, and hated this, their slavish doctrine. They could plainly discern that amidst all their *cant*, and fulsome adulation, they only meant themselves, and their own power.—The king, truly, was not to be resisted, while he was obedient to the clergy; and his divine right must be understood in subserviency to the convenience of the hierarchy.—Their passive obedience, their non-resistance, their submission without reserve or limitation, was, all the while, conditional—the implied condition was, that however the rights and liberties of the people might be sacrificed, *their* establishment must be maintained inviolate;

\* Burnet's History, p. 388.      † L'Esprit de Loix.



violate; and they must be supported in the plenitude of their power, and spiritual domination. For no sooner did these *passive* gentlemen perceive themselves in danger than they desert their principles, rouse the nation to resistance, and appeal to the favour of the people against the *Lord's anointed*, and to that universal jealousy which prevailed against the encroachments of the crown.\* They then forgot the doctrine they had so often taught, that the king was accountable to none but God, and that no one could resist him but under the penalty of eternal damnation.

For a long series of years, they had persecuted Protestant dissenters with unrelenting cruelty.† But now, in the hour of danger, they make their application to them, imploring their assistance, and earnestly beseeching them not to remember their former cruelties, for which they declared their sorrow, laying the blame upon the Papists. They protested their earnest desire of peace, and promised they would take effectual care to remove every

\* Even in the *seat of loyalty* at Oxford, the Duke of Ormond had read the Prince of Orange's declaration to the university, which notwithstanding their *famous* decree, and address to James, they received with universal *applause*, and offered their plate in a solemn deputation to the Prince. Dalrymple's Memoirs, p. 200. It is worth observing, that both universities had given all their treasures to support Charles I.

† Between the Restoration and Revolution, 60,000 persons are said to have suffered, on a religious account, in England. 5,000, or according to some, 8,000, died in prison. And it has been computed, that dissenters suffered in trade and property, from the act of uniformity, to the amount of 12 or 14 millions; and the greatest part of this enormous sum was lost to the nation. Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv. p. 450. De Laune's Plea for Non-conformists. The numbers that suffered in Scotland, during this period, by torture and death, or by forfeiture of estate, imprisonment, or exile, exceeds computation.

every thing which had hitherto prevented our *union* with them, if we would not hearken to the offers of the court, but would join in averting the present danger. These positive assurances not only of a toleration, but of a *comprehension*, Bishop Burnet says, passed through his hands, and were transmitted to the Prince of Orange. And he uses this strong expression, that should these promises be afterwards forgotten, these churchmen, would deserve to be reprobated of God and man. At that time, even high-churchmen thought a *comprehension* was not an impossible thing, as our author would affect to think. They, also, thought that Protestant dissenters were entitled to national confidence, and might be trusted in most perfect consistency of principle; for the ingenious fancy, which pleases the Bishop of Cloyne so much, of a constitution, and an *entire* constitution, I believe, was not then invented.

But, there are perhaps stronger and more honourable testimonies in favour of the principles and conduct of Protestant dissenters, at that trying period, than even these of the right rev. prelate. Lord Nottingham, in a letter to the Prince of Orange, so early as September, 1687, says, “ dissenters would not desire to assist King James in his views of publishing the declaration for liberty of conscience. They were pleased to enjoy the toleration, though they like not the method by which it is given them.” Lord Guilford says, “ they desired indulgence, but not at the price of all the laws; they had much rather have it in a parliamentary way. And in the next parliament they joined with many of the country gentlemen, who were no friends to them, to oppose  
“ the



“ the DECLARATION, so as they might have an  
 “ act of COMPREHENSION: wherein the others  
 “ *promised* all their endeavours.” To the same  
 purpose, Lord Hallifax writes to the Prince of  
 Orange, April 1688. “ The Papists discouraged  
 “ by their ill success in their attempts, some say  
 “ they are altering their scheme, and not finding  
 “ their expectations answered by the dissenters,  
 “ they have thoughts of returning to their *old*  
 “ *friends*, the high-churchmen.”\* And King  
 James finding that his declaration of indulgence  
 did not bring the dissenters into his views, said  
 they were people that could not be gained.†

Protestant dissenters with great generosity and  
 zeal entered into their views, but quickly found  
 their confidence was ill placed. For no sooner was  
 the appearance of danger over than the old prin-  
 ciples resumed their power. High-churchmen  
 thought they had gone too far in their opposition  
 to King James, and had it depended on them,  
 the Revolution had been defeated. A standing  
army of Englishmen was found to be more en-  
 flamed with the love of liberty than the establi-  
shed clergy. James could not depend on the army  
 to support him in violation of the laws and con-  
 stitution—the bishops could be depended upon,  
 and in the Convention Parliament, the ma-  
 jority of the right rev. bench voted against the  
 motion that the king had *abdicated*, and that the  
 throne was *vacant*.‡ So that King William was  
 advanced to the throne in opposition to the estab-  
 lished clergy. Protestant

\* Original papers in the appendix to Sir J. Dalrymple's  
 Memoirs, vol. iii. p. 106, 111, 125.

† Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. iv. p. 468.

‡ Life of King William, where we have a list of the  
 members of both houses, and the vote of every member  
 particularly marked, p. 190.

Protestant dissenters had contributed very much to the Revolution, and as they had received the strongest assurances of kindness from the high-church party, they now looked for the performance of these promises; and, it would seem, they had reason to hope for the accomplishment of them. For King William, in his answer to the addresses of the dissenting ministers, had assured them that he would employ all his power to obtain an *union* of his Protestant subjects. The Queen made the same declaration in their favour. And his Majesty, early in the session, expressed his hopes to both houses of his first parliament, that, "they would leave room for the admission  
 " of *all* Protestants that were willing and able  
 " to serve, which conjunction in his service  
 " would tend to the better uniting them among  
 " themselves, and strengthen them against their  
 " common adversaries." But the admission of dissenters into offices, notwithstanding all their services, and all the promises made them, was instantly and strenuously opposed by the high-church party. And even to our day, that party in England has never been able to acquire such liberality of sentiment as to enter into the enlightened views of King William's politics.

The motion for a bill of comprehension had no better success. Tillotson is said to have been the means of preventing that bill from passing in parliament, by proposing that it should first be considered by convocation. But no terms of union are ever to be expected from a convocation. The virtue of individuals may induce them, sometimes, to sacrifice their private interest to that of their country, but from any society of men, no such effort can be expected. The corruptions, or overgrown power of a so-

B b

ciety,



ciety, recommended by common utility, and justified by universal practice, are viewed by its members without shame or horror; and reformation never proceeds from themselves, but is always forced upon them by some foreign hand. Suitable to this unfeeling and inflexible spirit, was the behaviour of the convocation in the present conjuncture. All the demands of the dissenters were rejected with contempt. And the clergy, far from endeavouring, by any prudent concessions, to reconcile such a numerous body, broke their specious vows and promises made in their distress; began to shew an implacable hatred to the non-conformists, and seemed to wish for an occasion to renew their old methods of persecution.\*

Such were the returns made to dissenters for all their services, and such was the accomplishment of all those fair, but disingenuous promises of high-churchmen!

The Bishop of Cloyne and his apologist have adduced the authority of King William in favour of their ecclesiastical establishment. It were to be wished, however, that they had laid before the public an accurate account of what they mean by their ecclesiastical establishment, that we might have compared their opinion with the judgment of King William. And this is the more necessary, because if they agree with him, they must be in principle for a farther reformation of their church; and particularly for such a reformation of it as would promote an union of Protestants, and a comprehension of dissenters.  
For

\* Robertson's History of Scotland, vol. i. p. 91. Burnet's History of his Times, vol. ii. p. 7, 18, 19, 20.

For that was his majesty's idea: and the message that his Lordship has quoted from Tindal, was sent to the convocation that was assembled for the express purpose of considering the terms of the proposed comprehension, according to a scheme drawn up by an assembly of divines, who acted under the king's commission. So that nothing can be more evident than that he wished for an alteration in the established church. And what is still more remarkable, is, that he had expressed his hopes of this union of the church with dissenters, who had addressed him that it might be established, "by making the RULE OF CHRISTIANITY the RULE of CONFORMITY." And it was to this address he answered—"what-ever is in my power shall be employed in obtaining an union among you."\*

Both houses of parliament had addressed his majesty to call a convocation, assuring him that it was their intention forthwith to proceed to the consideration of giving ease to Protestant dissenters. In his answer, the king says, "he hoped the ease they designed to dissenters, would contribute very much to the establishment of *that* church, that is, the episcopal; and therefore he earnestly recommended to them, that the *occasions* of differences, and mutual animosities might be removed: and that as soon as might be he would summon a convocation." Now, in his message to this convocation, which the Bishop of Cloyne refers to, his majesty says, that he had "summoned it—out of a pious zeal to do every thing that may tend to the establishment of the church of England." But in his message to both houses of parliament, we see his opinion explained, that

B b 2

this

\* Life of King William, p. 202, 203, 212.



this church would be best established by giving the ease they designed to dissenters. And though this was the express purpose of summoning this convocation, his Lordship has taken no notice of it: that by giving the king's message without connection or reference to any former occurrence, it might appear a *general* declaration in favour of the ecclesiastical establishment, as it then stood, though nothing was farther from his majesty's intention.

And still farther, King William thought the test-act should be abolished, and that dissenters should be admitted to serve the state, and that they were entitled to national confidence, and might be trusted with the most perfect consistency of principle—in direct opposition to his Lordship and his apologist, and to the high-churchmen of that time, who founded the *alarm*, that *the church was in danger*.—"It was to be pulled down, and presbytery set up—for the church was as the word given out by the Jacobite party, under which they thought they might more safely shelter themselves."\*

So that the judgment of King William is decidedly against our opponents; and they must be much more *explicit* than they have yet thought it convenient, before they can avail themselves of so great an authority. No expression is more *equivocal* than the *church of England*. It has undergone great changes; and whether it was Popish or Presbyterian, whether it was monarchical or parliamentary, whether the convocation had power or was merely a nominal thing, or however this church was modified, still it was the church of England.

The

\* Burnet's History, vol. ii. p. 19.

The discontent, and vexatious disappointment of the great body of the established clergy, at the success of the Revolution, is no where painted in such striking colours, as in their controversies with one another at that time. Their contests among themselves, as usual, full of virulence. Their principles of allegiance full of perplexity and confusion, and the greatest dissingenuity. Their conduct most dishonourable to themselves, as men and as clergymen. And their political character, which is what we are here chiefly concerned in, most assuredly the worst that ever disgraced a free people.

They had formerly invented the notion of a *divine* hereditary right in princes, and on this had built their scheme of passive obedience and non-resistance. This favourite system, so long the subject of their doctrine and admiration, appeared to be all broken down by the principles of the Revolution, which maintained that the right of kings to the throne was neither *divine* nor hereditary, but was derived solely from the choice of the people, to be enjoyed with such conditions and limitations, as they might enact. A maxim that had been considered only as a theory of political writers, was now realized, and it was declared by both houses of parliament that, "there was an *original contract* between king and people."\* To save appearances in deserting their old principles, which were established by the church, or clergy, they have again recourse to invention, and luckily as they thought, find out a distinction between a king *de facto*, and not *de jure*; that is, in actual possession of the throne without a legal right; and in this view, some of them took the oath of allegiance, be-  
Note  
44.

\* Hume's History of England, vol. viii. p. 249.



cause in Scripture it is said, *the powers that be are ordained of God.*\* And in this they seemed easy and happy, that it did not destroy the legal right of the dispossessed prince, nor hinder him from claiming it, when he found "a safe opportunity;" as, *in the mean time*, no doubt, God may give the throne to whom he pleases.

Others, however, contended that this was to support injustice and violence, and to oppress innocence and right; and ask, can the providence of God make that our duty, which is so manifestly unjust and wicked? They, therefore, think themselves justified in a separation from the church, and in making a *schism*, which, in the case of dissenters, they had so often pronounced no less than a damnable sin. And they represent all who took the oaths to King William, especially the clergy, as apostates, at least, from the church of England, if not from the christian faith.†

Here

\* Ils ont donc grande raison quand ils disent que le précepte de leur Alcoran, qui ordonne de se soumettre aux puissances, n'est pas bien difficile à suivre, puisqu' il leur est impossible de ne le pas observer. Lettres Persanes, tome ii. p. 69.

† Those who are curious in these matters may be referred to the Bishop of Salisbury's Pastoral Letter, in 1689. Case of Allegiance to Sovereign Powers, by W. Sherlock, D. D. in 1691. A Defence of the Profession of Lake, Bishop of Chichester, on his death-bed, concerning passive obedience, in 1690. As this book may, probably, be in few hands, I will transcribe his profession. It is introduced under an awful sense of death, and with much solemnity, after having received the sacrament.—"Whereas the religion of the  
 " church of England, taught me the doctrine of non-re-  
 " sistance and passive obedience, which I have accordingly  
 " inculcated upon others, and which I took to be the *dis-*  
 " *tinguishing* character of the church of England, I adhere  
 " no less firmly and stedfastly to that, and in consequence  
 " of

Here we have our admired constitution, in the hands of these guardians of church and state, reduced, indeed, to what the Bishop of Cloyne calls, "the *strangeness* of casuistry." A question which the clergy managed so well, as to keep the nation in a perpetual ferment. Thus the rights of a free and brave people were perplexed and dishonoured by the idle chimæras of churchmen.

Is it in these *principles*, and in this *practice*, that Dr Stock finds the established church so well suited to the genius of the British monarchy, in England?

Let us now examine the principles and practice of episcopacy in Scotland, and how far it was adapted to the temper and habits of the people, and their monarchy.

When Laud introduced episcopacy into that kingdom, the canons, we have seen, established *arbitrary* power.—The first parliament of Charles II. established prelacy, which had been overthrown in the preceding reign, and enacted, that shewing any dislike of the king's *absolute* prerogative

" of it, have incurred a suspension from the exercise of my  
 " office, and expected a deprivation. I find in so doing  
 " much inward satisfaction, and if the oath had been ten-  
 " dered at the peril of my life, I could only have obeyed  
 " by suffering."

This profession is subscribed by the Bishop and five witnesses. He was one of the seven bishops that disobeyed their king, and was sent to the Tower, and tried for disobedience, and yet his apologist represents him as a *great champion* for passive obedience, and as acting *consistently* with his principles. He was one of those that was disobedient in King William's reign: and this, too, was meritorious. The author speaks of some other of these seven bishops as confessors for this doctrine of the church, and dying in like *odour of sanctity*.



prerogative be punished as seditious. This and the ensuing parliaments in this reign, enacted many cruel and sanguinary laws against Presbyterians. And though they were so severe as to raise the abhorrence of every one in whom any spark of humanity remains, yet was the execution of them more cruelly severe. Torture, and the gibbet were employed in the *regular* process of law, to enforce uniformity, and dragoons,\* and what was called, the barbarous Highland host, were employed as executioners, without any process of law.

The archbishops and bishops of Scotland, in their address to King James on the news of the Prince of Orange's undertaking, in a strain of the most fulsome flattery, express the highest approbation of his conduct and government, and profess a stedfast allegiance to his majesty, as an essential part of their religion.†

This summary account is enough to shew the principles and conduct of episcopals in Scotland, while that kingdom continued under what, our author calls, the *sceptre* of prelacy.

At the Revolution, presbytery was established, and the Convention Parliament in their declaration of right, assume a very different tone. They say, "that by the advice of wicked counsellors King James did invade the fundamental constitutions of the kingdom of Scotland, and altered it from a legal, limited monarchy, to an arbitrary and despotic power." And after enumerating the miscarriages of his reign, they did  
not

\* See Dean Swift's History of one of these dragoons.

† Life of King William, p. 140.

not spend their time as the English Convention Parliament did, in perplexing debates and vain distinctions of his having *abdicated*, or *deserted* the throne, but in the plainest terms, as became an injured people, deeply sensible of their former calamities, and of the invaluable blessings of liberty, they declare, that, "he had *forfeited* " the right of the crown, and the throne was " become *vacant*."

They afterwards declare, that "prelates and " superiority of any office in the church above " presbyters, is, and has been a great and un- " supportable burden to this nation, and con- " trary to the inclinations of the generality of " the people, ever since the Reformation—and " therefore ought to be abolished."\*

Need it be asked, whether the principles and conduct of the episcopal government in Scotland, or of this Convention Parliament that overturned episcopacy, and established presbytery, was most adapted to the genius of the British monarchy, and to the temper of the people.

A member, in his speech to the Convention Parliament, observes in a manly strain of eloquence, that, "it is strange any man can so " far degenerate as to prefer slavery to liberty, " and that they should be so much in love " with chains, that when they were fairly shaken off, " they should run furiously to be fettered again, " as if the Ottoman and French government " were so charming in our country, that we can- " not live without it, tho' we have so lately " groaned under the dismal burden of it: and

C c

" it

\* Life of King William, p. 216.



“ it might have been supposed, that even these,  
 “ who had been instrumental in enslaving their  
 “ fellow-brethren, and were grown *fat with suck-*  
 “ *ing the nation's blood*, would have taken another  
 “ method to reconcile themselves, than by per-  
 “ suading us to purchase their safety, at so vast  
 “ an expence as the ruin of more than three parts  
 “ of the nation will necessarily amount to.”\*

I am sufficiently aware that all this will appear light to a certain class of men, who would sacrifice the public happiness and safety to establish ecclesiastical dominion; but to others, and particularly to those, who are indeed friends to the British monarchy, and to the present reigning family, it will place the political principles of Presbyterians in a most honourable point of view. And it will, also, justify, in their opinion, the great aversion that the Scottish nation has always shewn to episcopacy. Because, “ if among dif-  
 “ ferent religions, there is one that has been  
 “ attempted to be established by methods of  
 “ *slavery*, it must there be odious; because as we  
 “ judge of things by the appendages we join  
 “ with them, it could never present itself to the  
 “ mind in conjunction with the idea of liberty.”†

The Bishop of Cloyne, however, would persuade us, that King William was against the suppression of episcopacy in Scotland; for he has assured us, that “ William, biassed as he must  
 “ naturally have been, in favour of the Presby-  
 “ terian church, did not wish the establishment  
 “ of it, *even* in Scotland—he *publicly* declared  
 “ his wishes to preserve *the bishops*, notwithstand-  
 “ ing the article against prelacy in the Claim of  
 “ Rights.” p. 13.

In

\* Life of King William, p. 221.

† L'Esprit de Loix, tome i. p. 416.

In the Life of King William, we have a very circumstantial account of the settlement of the kingdom and church of Scotland, and there is not the most distant hint in these *public* transactions, of any "wish" to preserve episcopacy. And yet his Lordship says, he "*publicly* declared "his wishes."—Whereas in all the *public* papers, which passed between the king and the Scottish nobility and gentlemen, first in London, and afterwards in the Convention at Edinburgh, there is not the least mention of any such *wishes*.

His Lordship has referred us to Burnet for this *public* declaration. And yet I cannot find any authority in Burnet for his Lordship's assertion. The historian tells us, that the "episcopal party" had sent up the Dean of Glasgow, whom they "ordered to come to him: and he introduced "him to the *then* prince. He was sent to know, "what his intentions were with relation to them. "He answered, he would do all he could to "preserve them, granting a full toleration to "the Presbyterians: but it was, in case they "concurred in the new settlement of that kingdom: for if they opposed that, and if, by a "great majority in parliament, resolutions "should be taken against them, the king could "not make a war for them." So that this *public* declaration, even by the authority to which his Lordship refers, comes out to be no more than what passed in a *private* confidential audience, given to a man who was commissioned by a party, and not by any representative of the kingdom. And considering that the principles of that party were intimately known to the Prince of Orange, as being utterly averse to the new settlement of the kingdom, and to his undertaking, and considering the terms in which he expressed



Note  
45.

himself, we cannot suppose that he had the smallest expectation that prelacy could be preserved, and it would have been strange, indeed, had he desired it.

The principles and conduct of the man to whom the Prince of Orange made this declaration, to which the Bishop of Cloyne refers, will help us to understand the full extent of it.

There could not have been a more *worthy* envoy of the episcopal party in Scotland than the Dean of Glasgow. Therefore he must have understood the Prince perfectly well, but in a very different sense from our learned prelate.

Note  
37.

He well knew the episcopal sect had rendered themselves so odious to the Scottish nation, that they could not be supported but by war—but “the king could not make war for them, nor “preserve them, if they did not concur in the new “settlement of that kingdom”—which, with all their power, they were determined to oppose.

How hard were these terms, and how mortifying to the disappointed hopes of an ambitious high-priest, which blasted all his schemes of persecution and tyranny! The Dean, however, being a zealous Jacobite, went over to King James, and attended him from France in his Irish expedition.\*

Such is the authority the Bishop of Cloyne has adduced to shew King William's attachment to episcopacy in Scotland.

Along with this, we may observe, what appears to be a most unaccountable inaccuracy that his

\* Life of King James, p. 282.

his Lordship has fallen into, in regard of history. He says, "notwithstanding the article against pre-lacy in the Claim of Rights, the king *publicly* declared his wishes"—as if the Claim of Rights had been then in being, and known to the king, and that he had made this *public* declaration in opposition to it. But the historian tells us, that it was "soon after the king came to St. James's." Now the king came to St. James's about the middle of December, and the Claim of Rights was not drawn up till April in the following year; that is, more than three months after his Lordship represents him making a *public* declaration against it.

So that this account is equally inaccurate and unsatisfactory, as that which we have already observed, he has given us of the message of King William to the English Convocation. And, indeed, it would appear from all the accounts that his Lordship, or his apologist has given of the church, or other affairs of Scotland, that they are very imperfectly acquainted with the history of that kingdom.

*Note*  
29. B.

Were we to pursue our inquiries into the political character of the hierarchy since the Revolution, we might have reason to conclude, that the constitution of the church not having received those improvements which King William so earnestly recommended, the spirit of the hierarchy was not altered. The fury and violence of the high-church in the latter end of Queen Anne's reign, and the unbounded licentiousness of their followers, threatened to lay open a scene of confusion equal to any that this nation had ever endured. The turbulent and factious temper of these men broke out then in its native fury, and shewed  
how



how willing they were, also, to fill up the measure of their fathers.

The trial of Sacheverel furnishes us with a full view of the principles and temper of the high-church clergy at this period. He was found guilty by the House of Lords, among other high crimes and misdemeanors, of maintaining that  
 “ the necessary means used to bring about the  
 “ happy Revolution, were odious and unjustifiable  
 “ —that the toleration granted to dissenters is unreasonable ; and that he is a false brother with relation to God, religion or the church, who defends toleration and liberty of conscience. That  
 “ it is the duty of superior pastors to thunder out  
 “ their ecclesiastical anathemas against persons  
 “ entitled to the benefit of the said toleration ;  
 “ and insolently dares, or defies any power on  
 “ earth to reverse such sentences. That as a  
 “ public incendiary, he persuades her Majesty’s  
 “ subjects to keep up a distinction of factions  
 “ and parties ; instils groundless jealousies, foment destructive divisions among them, and  
 “ excites and stirs them up to arms and violence.  
 “ That the church was in danger, &c.”\*

The Oxford decree, already mentioned, being given in evidence by Sacheverel on his trial, was ordered by the lords to be burned, as “ containing in it several positions contrary to the constitution of this kingdom, and destructive to the Protestant succession as by law established.”

Whether this decree has been condemned by any subsequent act of the university, the Bishop of Cloyne, probably, could inform us. But the reason of my mentioning these things so particularly,

\* Sacheverel’s Trial, p. 3, 4, 322, 326.

larly, is, that the cause of that incendiary was made the cause of the whole church. For we have it from one of high authority with the party, that "the clergy were altogether in the interests and the measures of the present ministry," meaning the Tory ministry in the end of Queen Anne's reign, "which had appeared so boldly in their defence, during a prosecution against one of their members, where the whole of their sacred order was understood to be concerned."\*

Thus we see what were the principles which these guardians of religion and of the constitution gloried in, but which in the judgment of an English parliament were contrary to the constitution, and destructive to the Protestant succession; and we see also, what obligations the present reigning family are under to the established clergy, and what their views were in regard to Queen Anne's successor in the throne.

These men had *for shame* ceased their clamours of passive obedience and non-resistance for a considerable time. But the opportunity was inviting, their hopes were revived of seeing their favourite prince restored to the crown of his father, and their clamours are now renewed with greater fury and madness than ever. In the most profound peace at home, and amidst all the success and glory that attended the British arms abroad, the alarm was sounded, the watch-word was given, as usual, *the church was in danger*, and all was in a flame. But when a rebellion was actually raised against King George I. and a *Popish Pretender* invaded the kingdom, these watchful guardians of religion and liberty could discern

no

*Note*  
42.

\* Dean Swift's Hist. of the four last years of the Queen, vol. i. p. 15.



no danger, and observed the most profound silence, as if no such clamour, or no such doctrine had ever been heard of.

The established clergy in Ireland were of the same temper and same principles: enemies of toleration, enemies of the Revolution, and of the house of Hanover. The address of their convocation to Queen Anne is full of virulence, and their language in some parts of it, unbecoming the character of gentlemen. They did not think it *prudent* to express their political principles in direct terms, as they were not quite certain that their schemes would be crowned with success; but in an indirect manner, they take care to express themselves in the strongest terms, knowing how grateful that must be to their English brethren, and to the then ministry. Taking occasion from the custom of the friends of the Revolution drinking the "glorious memory of King William," they *complain* to the Queen, that "wicked and "blasphemous HEALTHS are frequently used by "persons *disaffected* to our *constitution*: insomuch "that the words of our Litany, wherein we pray "to be delivered from plague, pestilence, and "famine, battle, murder, and sudden death, "have been turned into a bitter curse upon all "archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, "and all congregations committed to their "charge, who refuse to drink to the GLORIOUS "and IMMORTAL MEMORY of the dead." Page

15. *Thus we see, the Clergy of what is called the established Church of Ireland, assembled in Convocation, held, that the of Revolution-principles were disaffected to our Constitution*

Note

46.

The accession of the house of Hanover to the throne overturned their whole system of politics. The right to the throne was established by authority of parliament, and the constitution was fixed.

^ And could with confidence, profess themselves Jacobites in their address to Q. Anne, well knowing how consonant this profession was with the dark designs that were then agitated, & in which they were deeply involved, of defeating the Protestant Succession in the person of King George the first, & bringing in a popish Pretender.

ed on just principles of liberty, in direct opposition to the political principles of the established clergy.

From this cursory view of the political career of the ecclesiastical establishment, it must be evident, that it is so far from being *essential* to the state, that it stands in direct enmity to it—that it is so far from supporting the civil constitution, that there is the greatest necessity of being watchful to guard against its baneful influence—and that it is the sacred duty of a free people to divest it of all political authority, if indeed it has any.

And here it will be incumbent on the Bishop of Cloyne, or his apologists, to shew, that these are not the principles of the established hierarchy. For if they are fairly represented, the clergy (and it seems they are the church at present) are so far from being entitled to national confidence, that they are to be considered as the declared, and as the greatest enemies of the constitution. I speak not of individuals, many of whom are men of most amiable characters, and are personally known to me, for whom I have the highest esteem—but would try how the Bishop's favourite argument may be turned against himself—"The present argument does not apply to an impeachment of their conduct, but merely to the effects which those principles, whether true or false, must naturally produce on their respective dispositions, (and most strongly in minds of the greatest integrity) towards the present constitution of this kingdom. A just care of that constitution requires the author to point out the dan-

D d

"ger



“ger to the public from the tenets of the *established sect.*”\*

Let us try Dr. Stock's argument in the same way, which he has borrowed from his patron, and see how it may be turned against his church.  
 “—I look only to the *political* operation of your  
 “tenets. The more consistent you are in the  
 “profession of these, the stronger will be your  
 “desire, if ever a safe opportunity should offer,  
 “to alter the present constitution of this king-  
 “dom. Taking you for honest men therefore,  
 “government cannot in prudence admit you to  
 “any influence in the state—your sentiments in  
 “regard to our *civil* constitution, make it im-  
 “proper to trust you with power.”†

If these are not now the principles of the established hierarchy, we would wish to know when they were relinquished. We could not suppose that they should continue to be *openly* professed by high-churchmen under the government of the present reigning family, which they tended to subvert. The restraint for a time was submitted to reluctantly, but finding the government too firmly supported by the united strength of moderate churchmen and Protestant dissenters, and that their opposition could have no effect, they either lamented in obscurity, or vented their spleen in satire and invective, or adopted the principles that led to preferment.

But that their political consequence might not seem to be entirely lost, they luckily invented the new fanciful system of an *essential, natural* union of their hierarchy and the state. Their predecessors

\* Bishop of Cloyne, p. 20.

† Dr. Stock, p. 11.

predecessors at different periods spoke differently. The founders of this church at the Reformation, thought the ecclesiastical establishment might be modelled according to the prudence of the civil magistrate, and knew of no *essential* union of any particular form of church polity with the state. Afterwards the clergy treated the subject, not as a civil, but a theological matter; and had the impiety to assert, that their principles of passive obedience and arbitrary power, abject as they were, descended from Heaven, and with confidence pronounced, that they were to be received on pain of eternal punishment.—Such claims at present would be treated with ridicule. What the *new* system is, we cannot pretend to say. It is enveloped in a profusion of mysterious words that convey no meaning. The Bishop of Cloyne and his apologists, seem not to understand it, and sometimes seem not to understand one another, and therefore we need not wonder that they are called upon in vain to explain it.

A late ingenious author has treated of an alliance or compact between church and state.—*note*  
 “ The church, in consideration of the protection 47.  
 “ and *emoluments* given her by the state, has  
 “ yielded up her *independency* and *supremacy* to  
 “ the magistrate, and given him power to mo-  
 “ del her creed, to prescribe articles of faith,  
 “ forms of worship, terms of communion; and  
 “ sovereignly to direct, controul, and over-rule  
 “ her in all her *spiritual* concerns.”

Here we have the church represented as a *per-  
 son*, not merely by a figurative expression, which  
 is common, but as a person acting, forming al-  
 liances, and stipulating conditions with the state;



which is reducing the whole scheme to allegory and fiction. Besides, the allegory is not just in regard to the ecclesiastical establishment of England. For it supposes the state to be separate from the church; and that the church had assumed a certain *form* previous to this compact.—Whereas the state in establishing this church, acted by its supreme authority, dictating the terms, and commanding obedience. This system, it may be observed, is in direct opposition to the Bishop of Cloyne's idea of a *natural* union of church and state, for it represents the union to proceed from an agreement *voluntarily* entered into between two contracting parties. This, however, we apprehend is altogether visionary, invented merely to give some countenance to the wealth and power of ecclesiastics. But if any one would defend it as having something of reality, it would be necessary in the first place clearly to define what the church is, that has thus *contracted* with the legislature, and bartered her independency for gain. It cannot be the church, or followers of Christ, for they owe allegiance in matters merely spiritual to a higher master, which they have it not in their power to renounce, and therefore they cannot vest it in the magistrate. The clergy are sometimes called the church, and sometimes a congregation of faithful men: thus in the New Testament, we hear of a *church in a house*. Others give a very different account, for Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, held that “the church of England consists of the same sorts of people at this day  
 “that are comprised in the word *realm*, of whom  
 “the king is called the head: shall he not, being called head of the realm of England, be  
 “also the head of the same men, when they are  
 “named

“ named the church of England ? ” \* By which it would seem that the king’s supremacy meant no more than civil jurisdiction over all his subjects, whether laymen or ecclesiastics, and yet considering the bad character and principles of this man, his opinion may be deemed of no weight, and indeed, is only mentioned here as a vague definition of a term, upon which our opponents build their system of politics, and would advance their power, without telling what it means. But perhaps, this is no part of the Bishop of Cloyne’s new scheme, and may possibly be *included* in his censure, though he seem to direct it only to the church of Rome, where he says, that he “ is so far from justifying this *alliance*, that he thinks it a combination against “ the natural rights of mankind.” † And it would be very material in his own justification, if he could shew, that *his own system*, whatever it is, may not be liable to *his own censure*.

5

Dr. Stock, in conclusion, addresses himself to every class of people in support of his church, with those common-place arguments that would suit equally well the church of Scotland or Holland, of Rome or Germany, or any other ecclesiastical establishment. Though we can scarcely suppose, that they would all be equally forward in proposing the pastoral office merely as matter of emolument and livelyhood, and recommending their church under the lucrative, but not the most honourable view of a *lottery*, under the guidance of the blind goddess of fortune, offering to the young candidate many capital prizes, which may come in competition, in point of gain, with

\* Life of Bishop Ridley, by Gloucester Ridley, LL.B., p. 102.

† Bishop of Cloyne, p. 19.



with the army or the law.\* If this be the point of view, in which the sacred character is held out by a gentleman, who had the honour to be a fellow of Trinity College, and by his office engaged in the education of youth designed for the holy ministry—what shall we say—shall we wonder if *some* of those young men committed to such tutors, should consider their going into orders merely as a matter of emolument, and acting according to these views, should lose sight of the pastoral office, and give rise to such complaints of the clergy as we see in the printed debates of our House of Commons, and as we heard concerning some of them in the last session of parliament. It is to be hoped, that our learned author, when he had the honour of teaching in the college, gave more worthy and more honourable notions of the importance and dignity of the character of a clergyman, to the youth committed to his care. Such unguarded way of speaking, we would presume, he was only led into unadvisedly, to help out his cause, which, every one will see, required other sort of argument.

But, be this as it may, it is certain that many clergymen of the established hierarchy entertain the most honourable sentiments of the character and duty of the christian ministry, and of the motives that should induce men to enter into it. Speaking of the question proposed at ordination, “do you trust, that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost?” A prelate has observed. “that the answer—‘I trust, I am so moved’—ought well to be considered. For ‘if any says, ‘I trust so,’ and yet knows nothing of  
“any

" any such motion, and can give no account of it,  
 " he lies to the Holy Ghost, and makes his first  
 " approach to the altar with a lie in his mouth,  
 " and that not to men but to God. If the *mo-*  
 " *tives* which induce him to desire this office be  
 " not truly *religious* and spiritual, by venturing  
 " to give this answer, he is a sacrilegious pro-  
 " faner of the name of God, and of his Holy  
 " Spirit; he breaks in upon the church, not to  
 " feed, but to rob it."

But, in attending our learned opponent, we  
 are almost every where led away from our subject,  
 which ought to be confined to the political cha-  
 racter and importance of our ecclesiastical esta-  
 blishment: and, perhaps, more than enough has  
 been said to satisfy every fair enquirer, that

The episcopal clergy were the men, who first  
 attempted to persuade BRITONS to bow their  
 necks to the yoke of slavery—they were the men,  
 who first called the rights of our parliament in  
 question—they first preached up the absolute and  
 unlimited power of our kings, and paved the  
 way to the most grievous tyranny of our princes,  
 and the basest servitude of the people.

*Note*  
 42.

How humiliating for the genius of Britain to  
 have beheld her admired constitution, the boast  
 and pride of human wisdom, thus basely prosti-  
 tuted to the purposes of tyranny and priestcraft!

Is it not then astonishing that high-church-  
 men, in our day, should venture to speak of the  
 importance of their ecclesiastical establishment,  
 as the support of a free state, and that too under  
 the reign of the present illustrious family on the  
 throne,



throne, to whose accession they shewed the most determined enmity. Might it not, rather, have been expected, that they would have kept it carefully out of view, and avoided the necessity of contrasting their conduct and character with that of the Presbyterian church, as they had nothing to gain, but might lose a great deal by the comparison, as the tendency of their hierarchy was not to cherish and exalt, but to break down the noble and generous principles of the human mind. Their claims, therefore, of political importance furnish an instance, shall I call it, of bigotry, or prejudice, or folly, not to be equalled perhaps in the history of mankind, and for that reason, they have been so justly received with the general disapprobation and dislike of all the FRIENDS OF OUR ADMIRABLE CONSTITUTION.

Armagh,  
January 25, 1788.

---

## A P P E N D I X.

THE following observations were transmitted to me by a learned and ingenious friend, on whose veracity I have the most perfect reliance. With particular pleasure, therefore, I lay them before the public to rescue a very numerous and respectable body of our fellow-subjects from misrepresentation. The learned Doctor, as a gentleman of liberality of mind, will, I presume, think himself happy to find, that the Independents deserve a very different, and a much more worthy and excellent character than he has given them. Perhaps, he may take pleasure in doing justice to men, whom he has represented, I suppose, only for want of being better informed, in an injurious light. But, how far he may think it his duty to acknowledge his error, he must judge. If he calls in question the truth of any of the facts that are related, the ingenious author, who chooses to conceal his name at present, will, if necessary, come forward and authenticate them in person.

---

*To the* REV. DOCTOR CAMPBELL.

DEAR SIR,

THE Rev. Doctor Stock in his late attempt to answer your most judicious Reply to the Lord Bishop of Cloyne, has endeavoured, in the history of a Mr. Williams, to give the public such an idea of the conduct of Protestant dissenting  
E c congregations





‘ above. *The saints have found out many ways of putting a man to death without touching his skin,* says an ex-minister of theirs, the Rev. Mr. Williams, who spoke from experience.’

I can assure Dr. Stock, that Mr. Williams never had the smallest connection with the kirk, nor ever acknowledged his submission to any form of church government whatsoever. He was an INDEPENDANT in the Doctor’s sense of the word, but not according to the usual acceptation of it among English divines. The dissenters of England are divided into the three distinct bodies of PRESBYTERIANS, INDEPENDANTS, and ANABAPTISTS. Such of them as will submit to the authority of no tests of faith, invented and imposed by fallible men, belong, almost entirely, to the former of those denominations: the INDEPENDANTS, are in general, rigid CALVINISTS; and though they reject the forms of external church authority, have an high idea of the expediency of creeds and confessions. Strictly speaking, and as the word is to be understood in the religious history of England, there is not in this kingdom, one single congregation of Independants. Mr. Williams was educated among the most free and liberal of the Protestant dissenters, and always belonged to their denomination. He could not suffer from church authority, as he never in his life was minister to any society which submitted to the forms of church discipline.

A very long quotation which Dr. Stock has given from Mr. Williams’s Essays (beginning at page 72) is designed to set forth in lively colours the wretched and contemptible situation of the



dissenting clergy as ministers, scholars, and men of feeling, from the example of that gentleman. Had the reverend and *candid* opponent of Dr. Campbel known the true history of Mr. Williams's theological career, and the real causes of his separation from the dissenters, he would have found it hard indeed to have drawn, from this source, any inferences to the prejudice of that body of men. I cannot assert that no individual among them ever treated him with unkindness, but this I will maintain that the collective societies with which he was connected, manifested a degree of liberality towards him which has been exceeded by few religious assemblies of people. The principal congregation of which Mr. Williams ever was a minister, and among whom he resided the longest, was that of the MINT in Exeter. It must be against this society which his complaints are chiefly levelled; for (in sec. 41) he wholly exculpates that to which he afterwards removed in the neighbourhood of London. Those people were well trained up in the habits of free enquiry under the ministrations of those learned and excellent men PIERCE and HALLET; whose expositions of Scripture will convince all who read them of the good sense and liberality of their authors. As a proof that this religious society was by no means under the influence of that extreme bigotry and intollerance, which Doctor Stock and Mr. Williams would wish to persuade the world are the actuating principles of dissenters in general, I need only mention the following circumstance, for the truth of which I am able to produce the most respectable evidence, that the MINT congregation at Exeter when under the pastoral care of Mr. Williams, in order to accomodate themselves

selves as much as possible to his ideas, and to shew that they were not fettered by ancient prejudices or customs, consented to lay aside that mode of public prayer which they and their forefathers had used for many succeeding years, and to adopt in its room the LIVERPOOL LITURGY. Yet it is with reference to *this* society that Mr. Williams says, in section 43 of Doctor Stock's pamphlet, "the liberty of a dissenting minister is in my opinion much circumscribed. A strange spirit of bigotry and intollerance has ever possessed the dissenters."

Page 74, sec. 44, presents us with the following extract from Mr. Williams's intended farewell sermon to his flock at HIGHGATE. "The character of a dissenting minister, if it was in fact what it appears to be, would be on many accounts among the most honourable and desirable characters in the community. A man decently supported by the voluntary subscriptions of an independent society, to examine the truths of religion and morality, and to speak his thoughts on them according to his conscience, and with unbounded freedom—this would be a philosopher of the first order, and would rank among men of the first consequence in any state. I doubt not but many have taken orders among the dissenters with some such romantic character in their heads. I confess that I did, and I have been undeceived with great reluctance and vexation."

Perhaps Dr. Stock will be a little startled when he is assured from undoubted authority, what it was which opened the eyes of Mr. Williams with respect



respect to the dissenters, and inspired him with so much disgust against them—it was the unwillingness of his congregation at Exeter that he should continue in the ostensible office of their christian minister, after they thought themselves possessed of sufficient proof that he had relinquished his belief in the divine mission of Jesus Christ, and was, in the usual sense of the word, a DEIST. It must be acknowledged that the evidence of his infidelity was brought forward through the private pique of an individual—perhaps, at the time, it was not sufficiently strong—but Mr. Williams's subsequent conduct shewed it to be too well-founded, and that his sentiments on revealed religion were indeed such as rendered it impossible not only for a congregation of dissenters, but for a christian church of any description whatsoever, to remain under his ministry. In a very few years he publicly avowed his deistical principles in LONDON, opened a chapel in MARGARET-STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE, and invited men of all opinions (Atheists excepted) to the worship of one God. He printed and published a liturgy for the use of this society; in which all peculiarities of the christian institution are omitted, but which has one remarkable peculiarity of its own—many of the prayers are quotations in blank verse from MILTON and THOMSON, and the people are directed to make responses from the same authors.

It is on this *single instance* in the history of Mr. Williams, that Dr. Stock's observations to the discredit of dissenting congregations, with respect to the treatment of their ministers, are founded—he has not confirmed them by any other proof. Let the world judge from a fair representation

representation of facts, the most material of which are notorious to the public, how far Mr. Williams had reason to complain of the bigotry of his people, and how far Dr. Stock has served his own cause, or succeeded in exposing Protestant dissenters to general contempt, by the strong-coloured picture which he exhibits from the pencil of that gentleman. Surely if any man in the world may speak his genuine sentiments from a pulpit, on subjects of doubt and controversy, it is the free Presbyterian minister of England or Ireland. He acknowledges no controuling church authority in matters of faith—he refuses any subscription to tests composed by men fallible as himself—the word of God alone is the rule of his religious belief, and he may explain it to his people according to the best of his judgment and ability. *Has* any minister of the christian religion, or *can* any minister exercise a greater liberty in these respects than Doctor Priestly has taken? And yet who is more esteemed by a numerous and respectable congregation than that learned and spirited writer? Many of his flock widely differ from him in opinion; but all of them unite with him in maintaining the rights of free enquiry.

Prudence and moderation are qualities essential to a man's happiness in every department of life, and in all situations in which the clerical character can appear: where these are not wanting, few indeed are the instances where the dissenting pastor may not exercise all that liberty of thinking and speaking which is adapted to the sentiments of “a minister of the Gospel, a scholar and a man of feeling.” He may enjoy his own views of religion—he may impart them



them to his hearers—" he may aim at the highest and fairest fruits of that toleration which is allowed him—he may set every species of bigotry at defiance"—it is only necessary that he be a CHRISTIAN.

**F I N I S.**



